Heworth inc (Thom.)
K
2

A JUST
VINDICATION
OF SOME
PLAIN LETTERS
In the Defence of
Infant-Baptiſm,
AND OF
The Mode of BAPTIZING
(Now generally uſed in the Church of *England*)
BY
Sprinkling, or Pouring-on of Water.

BEING
A REPLY
TO
Dr. Ruſſel's *Juſt Vindication* (*as he calls it*) *of the Doctrine and Practice of St.* John *the Baptiſt*, &c.
WHEREIN
He pretends to have Examined and Confuted the ſaid Plain *Letters*,

LONDON,
Printed for *Richard Wilkin* at the King's Head in St *Paul*'s Churchyard. 1702.

A JUST

VINDICATION

OF SOME

PLAIN LETTERS

In the Defence of

Infant-Baptism,

AND OF

The Mode of BAPTIZING

(Now generally used in the Church of England)

BY

Sprinkling or Pouring on of Water.

BEING

A DIALOGUE

WHEREIN

The Grounds to have been Examined and

Confuted the said Plain Letters.

LONDON.

TO

The Right Reverend Father in God,

SIMON

Lord Biſhop of *Ely*.

MY LORD,

MY Examiner *having taken an Occaſion in his* Epiſtle Dedicatory *to addreſs himſelf to your* Lordſhip, *I hope that I may well preſume upon your* Lordſhip's *Pardon for taking the ſame freedom in this place.*

Indeed his Addreſs puts me in mind of ſome Votaries *of* Mercury, *concerning whom we read, that* they Worſhipped him, and at the ſame *time* threw Stones at him: *For thus has Dr.* Ruſſel *Complemented your* Lordſhip *for* good Temper and Moderation, *and at the ſame* time *has thrown Dirt into your Face.*

Speaking of the Mode *of* Baptizing, *he wou'd make the World believe that your* Lordſhip *own'd no other way of* Baptizing *but by* Dipping; *becauſe among the* various Waſhings *among the* Jews, *you obſerve there were their* Baptiſms or Immerſions of the whole Body, *&c.*

But he's ſo afraid of the whole Truth, *that he wou'd not ſee, or at leaſt he wou'd not confeſs, how your* Lordſhip *had prov'd, that from ſome other of the* Waſhings *among the* Jews, *the very* Heathens *had learnt to* Sprinkle *their Worſhippers with Water.*

He wou'd not acquaint us with theſe Words of your Lordſhip, That Baptiſm only upon the Face, ſignifies the Waſhing of the whole Body. *Nor with theſe*; A Chriſtian-Face which is beſprinkled with clean Water, ſhou'd bluſh at any Impurity. *Nor with theſe*; It had been better for him (*that is, a wicked Baptized Perſon*) if he had been branded with an hot Iron upon the Forehead, or ſcalding Oyl had been poured upon his Face, when it was Waſhed with Water in the Name of Chriſt.

Again, he cites out of your moſt excellent Diſcourſe concerning Baptiſm, *theſe Words*

This Point *(of Infant-Baptiſm)* hath been ſo ſifted even to the very Bran, that I cannot think mine Eyes ſo acute as to diſcern any little Argument to lye ſtill neglected that I ſhou'd be able to bolt out: The Cuſtom of the Church hath been pleaded, which is accounted the beſt Interpreter of a doubtful Law. And the Scriptures have been ſearched in theſe late Times (more I think than ever) by many Learned Authors in every one's Hands, and to ſuch excellent purpoſe, that if I were Able to plead the Infant's Title ſtrongly, my Defence might be ſpared.

And from hence he obſerves, that Whatever your *Lordſhip*'s private Opinion may be concerning Infant-Baptiſm, yet that you was unwilling to enter the Liſts of Contention about it.

By which ſly Inſinuation he has occaſion'd but too common a Muttering amongſt ſome People, That the Reaſon why your Lordſhip *wou'd* not enter the Liſts of Contention in the Defence of Infant-Baptiſm, *was, becauſe* Your private Opinion was againſt it.

And to confirm them in this miſchievous Thought, he tells them again and again, that your Lordſhip *has acknowledg'd it to be* A Doubtful Law, *whether Infants are to be Baptized.*

And is not this a very fit Man to find fault with others, who does ſo egregiouſly err himſelf? This is the Confident Man, that lays it to my Charge, that I have wrong'd your *Lordſhip: From which falſe Accuſation I have acquitted my ſelf in its proper Place, in the following Papers; and have nothing here to do, but to return it upon his own Head, to his moſt deſerved Shame and Reproach.*

And here I muſt beg leave of your Lordſhip *to acquaint the World, how notoriouſly your Mind and Meaning is* Miſrepreſented *in this Controverſie; and that it was not becauſe your* private Opinion *was againſt it, that your* Lordſhip *was unwilling to contend in the Defence of* Infant-Baptiſm; *but becauſe you then thought your Defence of it* might be ſpared: *It having been defended,* by many Learned Authors, from Scripture, to ſuch excellent Purpoſe, *and ſo convincingly, that in your* Lordſhip's *Opinion there was no need of any farther Proof; eſpecially, ſeeing that theſe* Scripture-Proofs *had been alſo back'd with* the Cuſtom of the Church, which is the beſt Interpreter of a Doubtful Law.

Certainly Dr. Ruſſel's *Conſcience as well as Forehead was harden'd, when he from hence concluded, that your* Lordſhip *affirm'd it to be* A Doubtful Law, *whether Infants are to be Baptized; when your* Lordſhip's *plain Meaning was, that* There cou'd not reaſonably be any Doubt in the Caſe.

For I cannot underſtand the Meaning of your Words to be leſs than

this

this. " *If after all the* Scripture-Proofs, *which* to ſuch excellent " Purpoſe *have been urg'd* by Learned Men, to defend the In- " fants Title to Baptiſm; *if any ſhou'd be ſo weak as ſtill to* " doubt *of it, yet certainly when theſe* Scriptures *have likewiſe* " *been confirm'd with* the Cuſtom of the Church, which is the " beſt Interpreter of a Doubtful Law, *this muſt convince even* " *the moſt ſcrupulous, and leave no farther* Doubt *remaining.*

I appeal to your Lordſhip, *and to every unbiaſs'd Reader of your Words, Whether this be not your juſt Meaning; and conſequently, whether* Dr Ruſſel *hath not* wronged *your* Lordſhip *by a moſt pernicious wreſting of your Words.*

And to undeceive *thoſe whom he has endeavour'd to* deceive *by this Abuſe of your* Lordſhip's *Authority, I wou'd farther acquaint them, That tho' you thought it needleſs by any long Defence* to plead the Infant's Title to Baptiſm; *yet that* you briefly diſmiſs this Head, with four *ſuch* Conſiderations, *as might (if impartially conſider'd) be enough for ever to ſtill the Controverſie.*

Dr. Ruſſel *indeed has cited* theſe Words *in your* firſt Conſideration. If there were any Infants in the Jaylor's Family, it is certain they were Baptized, *for he was Baptized and all his*; it is doubtful indeed, whether there were any or no. *And, ſays the Doctor,* This modeſt and humble Stile in which his *Lordſhip* expreſſes himſelf, is to me very affecting. *But, my* Lord, *'tis fit it ſhou'd be known that he did not* affect *your following Words, or durſt not acquaint his Party with them; for they are theſe:* Yet it is conſiderable, (eſpecially in conjunction with other Arguments) that neither here, nor any where elſe in the whole Scripture are they (viz. *Infants*) excepted; (and it is ſcarce to be thought, that all of the Families Baptized, were without Infants) nor is there one Word that tends to the excluding of them from Baptiſm.

Nay, but that they ought not to be excluded, is ſo evidently prov'd by your next Three Conſiderations, *that I heartily wiſh that your* Lordſhip's *Book was* in every one's Hands.

I am thro'ly aſſur'd by it, that you are a ſtrenuous Aſſerter of the Cauſe *which I have eſpous'd, and that you will not deny* it *your* Patronage; *and therefore I have nothing here to do farther, but to beg* your *Lordſhip's* Pardon *for the Defects in my weak managery of it, and* your uſual Candidneſs *in Judging of the well-meant, (tho' mean) Endeavours of*

My Lord,

Your Lordſhip's moſt Humble
and Obedient Servant,

Tho. Hewerdine.

TO THE

JOINT-PARISHIONERS

OF

March, *Doddington*, *Wimblington*, and *Benwick*.

AFTER my *plain Letters* (as you, *my Brethren*, well know) had been ſorely threaten'd with an *Anſwer* for above Two Years together, at length the *Terrible Thing* comes forth: And to let you know why it was ſo long a coming, *The Author* tells you, that *he did not ſuppoſe that any of their Perſuaſion were concern'd to take ſuch publick Notice of my Book, becauſe he did not find any ſolid Arguments or Proofs from Scripture therein; and therefore he did not apprehend that any one of ſound Judgment cou'd be deceiv'd thereby.*

This and ſomething more to the ſame purpoſe is what the *Author* is pleaſed to *confeſs*; and ſome of you, my Brethren, can add, that you have been told by the *Author*'s Friends among our ſelves that another reaſon why my *plain Letters* were no ſooner anſwer'd was, becauſe *they had ſtarv'd their Cauſe.* And how Dr. *Riſſel* will be pleaſed with this *Confeſſion* of his Friends, ſhall not be my Concern. In ſhort,

The Doctor tells you, that *He was importun'd, and preſt with Importunity*; and his Friends have told you, that *they both Pray'd and Pay'd*: And for ſome ſuch Reaſons you have now *his Book* in Anſwer to *mine*, *Dedicated* and ſent down to you.

What is to the purpoſe in that *Epiſtle Dedicatory*, and in the *Other to the Reader*, I ſhall meet with an Opportunity of ſpeaking to it, when I come to *examine* with what Candidneſs, Sincerity and Truth he has *examin'd* and *confuted* my *Plain Letters*; which he in his *Book* undertakes to do, as we are told in the *Title-Page.*

Only One thing I will here take notice of in his Two Epiſtles: He complains heavily of ſome of the *Inferior Clergy*, whom he repreſents as *Men of little Learning and Judgment, and unskill'd in the Controverſie between us*; and whom he calls, *The ignorant and peeviſh Sons of the Church of* England.

And

And what's the matter now? Why truly *theſe peeviſh, ignorant, inferior Clergy, give Him and his Party the Trouble of Defending* (what ſome of his Friends have call'd) *a Starv'd Cauſe*; and that too, *without any juſt Provocation.* He and the Writers on his Side are good, quiet, harmleſs, peaceable things; poor Worms, that never turn again till they are trodden upon; never meddle but *when they are Attack'd*; *they are only on the Defenſive part, and therefore cannot be charged as Aggreſſors.*

And now ſo far as all this concerns me, I will inquire into the Truth of it.

And I appeal to you, my Brethren; was it *out of Peeviſhneſs*, was it *to be Troubleſom*, was it *without a juſt Provocation*, that I undertook the Defence of Infant-Baptiſm? Had not the Oppoſers of it among us made a long and a loud Cry againſt it, before I ſeem'd willing to hear, or to ſpeak? Came there not *Teachers* from all Quarters, to run it down in the *Meeting-Houſe*? And did they not compaſs Houſe and Cottage to invite you to come among them, to hear this brave Man, and the other brave Man? Did they not induſtriouſly diſperſe their Books among you? Were not *they very troubleſom* to you almoſt in all Places, and in all Companies.

And was there *no Provocation* in all this? Or was it *Peeviſhneſs*, or *Troubleſomneſs* in me, that I did no lenger ſit ſtill, and be ſilent?

The Truth is, to put ſome Stop to them in this furious Career, I did (and I thought it my indiſpenſible Duty ſo to do) undertake the Defence of Infant-Baptiſm in ſome *Sermons* which I then preach'd amongſt you.

And the firſt Sunday that I then preach'd upon this Subject, it being underſtood from the Concluſion of my Diſcourſe in the Afternoon, that I intended the next Lord's-Day to diſcourſe ſtill farther upon the ſame Subject; I need not remind you with what Unchriſtian Indignation the Report hereof was entertain'd by the Oppoſite Party: However, when the next Sunday came, I was favour'd by Two of their *Teachers* at the Church to hear me, who had their Pen, Ink, and Paper, and ſeem'd to take down in Short-Hand the Sermons which I that Day preach'd.

And what was the Behaviour of this diſcontented People the next Morning? To ſay no worſe of it, it was uncivil and unkind; ſome of you told them to their Faces, that *they might be aſham'd on't*: And when they cou'd no longer Rail without Rebuke, what ſilly and impertinent Papers did they then drop in the Streets? What fooliſh and ridiculous Letters did you find directed to me, but without any Name ſubſcrib'd? And

at

at the long-run, at the moſt publick Place of the Town, was poſted up a *Paper*, with theſe Words.

" Theſe are to give Notice to all Perſons that are diſpos'd " for to hear, That there will be a Stranger to Preach at the " *Baptiſt-Meeting-Houſe*, upon Wedneſday the ſeventh of this " inſtant *June*, about one of the Clock: Wherein will be " ſhewn the Lawfulneſs of Believer's Baptiſm, and the Unlaw- " fulneſs of Infant-Baptiſm, by the Scripture's Authority, " againſt Mr. *Hewerdine*'s ſpecious Pretenſions for Infant- " Baptiſm.

And beſides this publick Notice, you were again from Houſe to Houſe bidden to this Meeting. At the Time appointed the *Stranger* came, and Preach'd both that and the next Day following, and what ſtrange Work was made with my *Specious Pretenſions* (as they call'd them) ſome of you can ſtill remember.

Great indeed was their Noiſe and Clamour upon this Occaſion, and it was in my own Defence that I was forced to publiſh thoſe *Plain Letters*, for which Dr. *Ruſſel* has ſo courſely treated me.

When theſe *Letters* indeed were printed, I was not ſo *peeviſh*, I was not ſo *troubleſom*, as to acquaint the World with this Occaſion; I had rather that the inſolent and obnoxious Behaviour of this People might have been conceal'd: And they may thank their *Author* for this Account of it which I am now forced to give, to wipe off the Charge which he has brought againſt me, *of Peeviſhneſs and Troubleſomneſs, of Blotting innocent Paper without Provocation, of being needleſly Contentious*, and the like.

But I hope, my Brethren, that I ſhall not be thought peeviſh, if upon this juſt Occaſion I return the Doctor his own Words; that *He is a falſe Accuſer, and guilty of the Breach of the ninth Commandment; for he has born falſe witneſs againſt his Neighbour.*

And now to clear the Way to a particular Vindication of my *Plain Letters*, I will here endeavour to lay the Duſt which he has rais'd about the Order and Method of them.

He tells you, that *my firſt Three Letters are about the Mode of Baptizing Infants*, which, ſays he, *are a very improper Beginning; for till it be firſt prov'd that Infants are to be Baptiz'd, 'tis in vain to ſhew how it is to be done.*

And I will indeed acknowledge, that Mr. *Baxter* begins his Book with his Proofs of *Infant-Baptiſm*; and after them, proceeds to a Defence of the *Mode of Baptizing by pouring on Water.*

And

And yet his Antagoniſt Mr. *Fiſher* was no better pleas'd with his Method, than Dr. *Ruſſel* is with mine: No, but when Mr. *Fiſher* attempted a particular *Anſwer* to Mr. *Baxter*'s *Book*, he firſt fell foul upon his Arguments in the Defence of the *Mode of Baptizing*, and pretended to anſwer his Proofs of *Infant-Baptiſm* in the laſt place.

Which is juſt ſuch a *croſs Anſwer*, as Dr. *Ruſſel* gives to my *plain Anſwers*: And what can be the meaning of ſuch awkward and blind Proceedings? It ſeems to me indeed, that theſe Gentlemen are reſolved upon a Method of Anſwering Books (as the Vulgar Report tells us that the Witches do ſay their Prayers) *backwards*.

But now to Dr. *Ruſſel*'s Accuſation, That mine is an *improper Beginning*; I thus anſwer.

That the *Three firſt Letters* in my Book, are not ſuch an improper Beginning as this Doctor makes them; for he falſly ſpeaks, as if they were only about the *Mode of Baptizing Infants*; whereas 'tis undeniable, that (without reſpect to the Subjects of Baptiſm) they are about *the Mode of Baptizing now generally uſed in the Church of* England.

And are none but *Infants* Baptized in the *Church of* England? Have we not in our *Common-Prayer Books*, *The Miniſtration of Baptiſm, to ſuch as are of Riper Years?* as well as, *The Miniſtration of Infant-Baptiſm*: And is not *the Mode of Baptiſm by pouring on Water*, allow'd and practis'd in both Caſes? And you my Brethren, know that I have *thus* Baptized Perſons of Riper Years, as well as Infants, among our ſelves. Nor is there any thing in my *Letters* that confines them to the Mode of Baptizing Infants only.

Do I ſpeak of Infants in that plain Queſtion, to which Dr. *Ruſſel* has not vouchſaf'd me an Anſwer. *Shou'd a* Turk *upon his Death-Bed be converted to* Chriſtianity, *and earneſtly deſire Baptiſm; how cou'd it ſafely be done, if there were no other way of Baptizing, but by Dipping?*

And now will the Doctor ſay, that this was *an improper Beginning*, to prove how Adult Perſons (as well as Infants) may be Baptiz'd; before I had prov'd *Infant-Baptiſm*.

But you muſt excuſe him; for he had a merry Story to tell, and it muſt be brought in, tho' it be by the Head and Shoulders.

But then, when I come to diſcourſe of the Subjects of Baptiſm, the Doctor charges me with want of *Logick* and Method, becauſe I firſt inquire what was done by the Diſciples

and Apoſtles of Chriſt in the Caſe of Baptizing, before I had firſt ſhew'd, that they were commiſſion'd to Baptize.

And again, he calls it a *prepoſterous Undertaking*, to ſeek in Scripture for an Example of their Baptizing, before I had prov'd a Commiſſion from Chriſt for their ſo doing. For ſays he, *'Tis to lay a heavy Charge upon them, that they ran before they were ſent; that they acted without a Commiſſion from their Lord, and were guilty of Will-Worſhip.*

Not ſo faſt, ſweet Sir, for I will be bold to tell you, that I find the Diſciples of Chriſt Baptizing in Scripture, before I find any Commiſſion or Command for their ſo doing. See *John* 4. 2. But now will you ſay, that *theſe Diſciples ran before they were ſent, that they acted without a Commiſſion from their Lord*, &c. For my Part, I will rather ſuppoſe that they had a Commiſſion, tho' the Scripture ſays nothing of it.

However, I am ſure that St. *John* firſt tells us, that the Diſciples of Chriſt Baptized, before he ſhews us that they were Commanded ſo to do: And will Dr. *Ruſſel* ſay that this was *prepoſterous*, and that St. *John* is an *illogical* and *immethodical* Writer; and that his firſt Work ſhou'd have been, to ſhew, that Chriſt had commanded his Diſciples to Baptize, before he had told us, that they did Baptize?

This, my Brethren, is the want of Logick and Method which the Doctor charges me withal; and whether I ſhou'd now forſake the Method of the *Beloved* St. *John*, to follow this *Rambling Man*, judge ye.

And having now removed this Stumbling-Block out of your Way, I will proceed to a particular *Vindication* of my *Plain Letters*, in the very ſame Method and Order in which you find them in my Book.

Earneſtly praying to the great God of Peace and Truth, to deliver us from all Falſe Doctrine, Hereſie and Schiſm; and that it may pleaſe him to bring into the Way of Truth all ſuch as have erred and are deceived.

In which very needful and ſeaſonable Petitions, I hope you my Brethren will not ceaſe to joyn with

Your very Faithful,
and Humble Servant,

T. H.

A JUST VINDICATION OF LETTER I.

IN my *First Letter* I ſhew, That in the Sacrament of *Baptiſm* there's the *Outward Sign*, and the *Thing ſignify'd*. And then in the Defence of our Mode of Baptizing by *Sprinkling*, I argue from the *Thing ſignify'd* to the *Sign*.

I affirm in the Words of our *Church-Catechiſm*, that *The Outward Sign is Water, wherein the Perſon is Baptized in the Name of the Father*, &c.

And I ſhew, that the *Inward Part*, or *Thing ſignify'd* by the Water in Baptiſm is the *Holy Spirit*, or *the Gifts and Graces of the Holy Spirit:* Such as theſe mention'd in our *Catechiſm*; *A Death unto Sin*, and *A New Birth unto Righteouſneſs*, &c.

And this I prove from ſeveral plain Texts of Scripture, wherein the Inward Part of Baptiſm is expreſt by *the Renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*; being *Sanctify'd with the Spirit*, and *Born again of the Spirit*.

And M^r. *Grantham* (one of our Learned'ſt Adverſaries in this Controverſie) in *a Friendly Epiſtle, written with the Advice of divers Paſtors and Brethren* of his Way, aſſures us, That they do all heartily ſubſcribe to this, that *in Baptiſm there's an Inward and Spiritual Grace*. Pag. 23.

But here my Examiner D^r. *Ruſſel* ſingles out himſelf, and proclaims open War againſt me; and to erect an early Monument to his Self-Confidence, he not only ſets me at Defiance, but Huffs and Hectors all the Prieſts in Chriſtendom.

Suppoſing that he ſhou'd deny, and with the ſame Breath *really and indeed denying, that the Baptiſm of the Spirit is any part of Water-Baptiſm:* Nay and immediately after, he undertakes to prove that it is not; having added, that *He hath ſaid enough in*

his other Writings upon this Subject, to convince any Man of this Miſtake; and that he is ſorry that my Folly ſhou'd cauſe this Repetition.

And really I am as heartily ſorry, that this Man's ſecond Thoughts ſhou'd be no *wiſer* than his firſt; but that he ſhou'd ſtill perſiſt in his groſs Miſtake, and trouble us with this *Repetition* of it.

However, I'll have the Patience to examine his *Crambe*, and to anſwer and confute both his Objections and Proofs.

Indeed, conſidering what manner of Spirit his Writings diſcover him to be of, he begins wonderfully, and not like himſelf; for he vouchſafes to ask me a *Civil Queſtion*, which I will own to be no Repetition; for 'tis the only Inſtance of his Civility to me in his whole Book.

His *Civil Queſtion* is this, *Whether the Apoſtles of our Lord were not converted before his Aſcenſion into Heaven.* He, means before the Holy Ghoſt was ſo miraculouſly given them upon the Day of *Pentecoſt*, for he owns no Baptiſm with the Spirit, beſides that Extraordinary One.

And this is the palpable Miſtake which his *Civil Queſtion* is grounded upon; for there's no Diſpute or Queſtion to be made on't, but that the Apoſtles of our Lord were renew'd and ſanctify'd by the Holy Spirit, long before it was poured upon them after that miraculous manner.

Well! But becauſe I have affirm'd the Sanctifying Graces of the Holy Spirit to be the Inward Part, or Thing ſignify'd by the Water in Baptiſm; it may here be ask'd, Whether the Apoſtles of our Lord were ever ſo ſanctify'd: That is to ſay, Whether they were made Partakers of the Inward and Spiritual Grace, by partaking of that Water-Baptiſm, which is the Outward and Viſible Sign. To which I anſwer,

Firſt, That the Inward and Spiritual Graces are not ſo abſolutely ty'd to the Outward Part of this Sacrament, but that many Exceptions have been, and are ſtill confeſt to be ſufficient to obtain them without it; for juſt and wiſe Reaſons our Lord has ſometimes given, (as he might have done to his Apoſtles) the Inward Part of this Sacrament, *(Rem Sacramenti)* without the External Application of it.

But ſecondly, I obſerve, That D^r *Ruſſel* is dignify'd and diſtinguiſh'd by the Pompous Title of *a Lover of Primitive Chriſtianity*; and therefore the Words of a *True Lover of Primitive Chriſtianity*, may perhaps be of ſome weight with him; I mean the very Learned Dr *Cave*; who in the Life of St *Peter* thus * ſpeaks; "It "may here be enquired when and by whom the Apoſtles were "Baptized,

* *Antiquit. Apoſt.* pag. 11.

" Baptized, that they were Baptized is unqueſtionable, being " themſelves appointed to conferr it upon others; but when or " how, the Scripture is altogether ſilent.

But now then whenſoever it was that the Apoſtles were Baptized with the Outward Part of Baptiſm, which is *Water*; then it was that in an ordinary way they were renewed with the *Holy Spirit* too, which is the Inward Part of that Sacrament; and which all are Partakers of, who rightly and duly partake of the Outward Part, as I doubt not but the Apoſtles did.

But that this *Baptiſm with the Spirit* is any Part of *Water-Baptiſm*, is what Dr *Ruſſel* very ſtiffly denies, and *wonders that any Prieſt in Chriſtendom that hath read the New Teſtament ſhou'd ſuppoſe any ſuch Thing.*

Sir, To give you a Taſte how pleaſantly your own Words reliſh, *You know that it is common for Perſons that are ignorant to admire thoſe things they do not underſtand; and this by your own Confeſſion is your preſent Caſe, for this is what you wonder at. But pray be patient a little*, and ſuffer me to uſurp upon the Faculty, as you do upon the Prieſthood; *and I doubt not but by the help of God to couch your Cataract, and then you may ſee clearly*, that you have no cauſe to wonder at what *the Prieſts of the Church of* England *ſuppoſe* and teach concerning this Matter.

And to this End I will conſider what you have alledg'd to prove, *that the Baptiſm of the Spirit is not a part of, but a diſtinct Baptiſm from that of Water.*

And this, ſay you, I thus prove, *Mat.* 3. 11. *Where* John *the Dipper ſaith, I indeed Baptize you with Water, but he that cometh after me* (i. e. *Chriſt*) *he ſhall Baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt*, Mark 7. 8. you miſtake the Chapter, for 'tis *Mark* 1. 8. *I have baptized you with water, but he ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt.* See *Luke* 3. 16. and *John* 1. 33. where *John* points to Chriſt, and ſaith, *That is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghoſt.* See *Acts* 1. 3, 4. where you miſtake the Chapter again, for 'tis *Act.* 2. which you wou'd have ſeen *Chap.* 11. 16. *And when Cornelius and his friends* (which *Peter* there ſpeaks of) *had been baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, they were afterwards baptized with water, in the name of the Lord.* Act. 10. 47, 48.

From all which you obſerve, Firſt, *That it is not in the power of Man to Baptize with the Holy Ghoſt, but that Chriſt alone is the Adminiſtrator of that Baptiſm.* And thus far I agree with you, for I made the Obſervation to your Hands, in that very Letter which you are here pretending to confute.

You obſerve Secondly, *That thoſe Baptiſms muſt be Two diſtinct Baptiſms, becauſe thoſe that were Baptized with Water, were not Baptized*

Baptized with the Spirit till a long time after, and ſome of them not at all; and others that were firſt Baptized with the Spirit, were afterwards Baptized with Water.

And Thirdly, you obſerve, *That no Man is now Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.

To which Obſervations I will give you an Anſwer out of M^r *Fiſher*, a Writer of your own Way, and whoſe Works you recommend to our peruſal, *pag.* 85.

" * I cannot but profeſs my ſelf aſhamed (ſays M^r *Fiſher*) " at their curious Conceit, who diſtinguiſh " the Baptiſm of Water and that of the " Spirit, into *John*'s and *Chriſt*'s, and oppoſe " theſe Two one to the other, ---- *I indeed " baptize you with water*, ſays St *John*; that is, " We Men can adminiſter no farther to you, being but Meſſengers " from Chriſt to do that; *but he ſhall Baptize you with the Holy " Spirit.* And as *John* did Baptize only with Water, ſo with " no more than Water did all the Diſciples and Apoſtles after " Chriſt crucify'd Baptize; and not with the Spirit, for that " Chriſt only did in their due Diſpenſation of the other. Obſerve, In the due Diſpenſation of Water-Baptiſm by the Diſciples of Chriſt, Chriſt himſelf Baptized with the Holy Spirit.

* Παιδοβαπτίζοντες καὶ βαπτίζοντες. P. 477, 488.

† And again, he ſhews, That Chriſt by his Diſciples Baptized as well as *John*, and tho' *John* cou'd go no farther than the outward Adminiſtration of of Water; yet Chriſt was impower'd to diſpenſe higher Matters, even when by his Diſciples he Baptized with Water, to diſpenſe the Baptiſm of the Holy Spirit likewiſe: " Chriſt is able (ſays he farther) beſides the Sign, to vouchſafe " the very Thing ſignify'd thereby.

† *Id.* pag. 480.

And thus does M^r *Fiſher* perfectly agree with me, againſt D^r *Ruſſel*, in this great Truth, that when the Miniſters of Chriſt Baptize with Water, which is the Sign or Outward Part of that Sacrament; Chriſt himſelf Baptizeth with the Holy Spirit, which is the Inward Part, or Thing ſignify'd.

But, ſays D^r *Ruſſel*, *Some were firſt Baptized with the Spirit, and afterwards Baptized with Water.* To which * M^r *Fiſher* anſwers again, That " God, whoſe Ways limit us, " not himſelf, was ſometimes better than his " Word, and anticipated his Promiſe, and " gave the Holy Spirit before Baptiſm, " *Act.* 10. But this is more than can be " expected in an Ordinary Way. *Act.* 2. 38.

* *Idem*, p. 477. *in the Margin*; *and* p. 148.

D^r *Ruſ-*

Dr *Ruſſel* indeed pours out abundance of Scorn upon me for uſing that Text to this purpoſe, and thinks to evade the Force of it with a pitiful Cavil; that *To receive the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, is a different Expreſſion from that of being Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt*, in *Mat.* 3. *Act.* 1, *&c.* his former Miſtake is reiterated; he means, *Act.* 2.

But his Friend * Mr *Fiſher* will juſtifie me here again, who applies the Text juſt as I did, and ſays plainly, that "In the "Word of God, it is not required that "Perſons be Baptized with the Holy Spirit "firſt, in order to their Baptiſm with Water; "but that they be firſt Baptized with Water, in order to their "receiving the Holy Spirit, *Act.* 2. 38. * P. 149.

I deny, ſays Dr *Ruſſel*, *that all thoſe that Chriſt's Miniſters do Baptize with Water, are Sanctify'd with the Spirit, much more Baptized with it*; *for* Simon *himſelf was Baptized*, Act. 8. 13. *and yet he was in the Gall of Bitterneſs, and in the Bond of Iniquity*; *an unſanctify'd Man notwithſtanding.*

But does the Doctor bring this Inſtance to prove the Baptiſm of the Spirit to be no part of Water-Baptiſm, or that Chriſt does not Baptize any with the Spirit, whom his Miniſters Baptize with Water.

What? becauſe ſome wicked Men receiving the Bread and Wine at the Lord's Supper are ſo far from partaking of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, that they eat and drink Damnation to themſelves; Does it thence follow, that the Body and Blood of Chriſt is not the Inward Part, or Thing ſignify'd by the Bread and Wine in that Sacrament? Or that none who partake of the Bread and Wine, do alſo partake of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, becauſe wicked Men do not?

In like manner, becauſe when wicked Men and Hypocrites (ſuch as *Simon Magus* was) are Baptized with Water, they are far from being Sanctify'd with the Holy Spirit too: Does it thence follow, that the Sanctifying Graces of the Holy Spirit are not the Inward Part, or Thing ſignify'd by the Water in Baptiſm? Or that none who are Baptized with Water are alſo Sanctify'd with the Holy Spirit, becauſe wicked Men are not?

'Tis imply'd, That Baptiſm *waſheth away Sins*, Act. 22. 16. But is it the mere external Waſhing with Water that does ſo?

Certainly to put aſunder what God hath joyned together, and to make a Divorce between the Outward and Inward Part of Baptiſm, is to make the Baptiſmal Waters like to the unhallowed and virtueleſs Waters, (*Viduis Aquis*, as * *Tertullian* calls them) in which the Heathens did waſh and purify themſelves. * Tetull. *de Baptiſmo*, c. 5.

And indeed Dr *Russel* does himself tell us from Dr *Barlow*, that antiently the Baptized were called *Illuminati*: But pray Sir be ingenuous, Were they *illuminated* with *Water*, or with the *Spirit*?

When St *Paul* speaks of those who were once *enlightned* or *illuminated*, and were made *Partakers of the Holy Ghost*; the words are truly interpreted of those who were *Baptized*. Heb. 6. 4. And *by one Spirit we are Baptized into one Body*, says the same Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13.

And when the Eunuch was Baptized, 'tis said in *the King's Manuscript of the New Testament*, that *the Holy Ghost fell upon him*, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τ Εὐνῦχον· and [a] Dr *Cave* tells us, that many other Manuscript-Copies have the same Words.

[a] Cod. Alexand. in Bibl. Reg. Angl. aliique plures Cod. MSS. *Cave*'s Apost. *p.* 3. *in the Margin.*

[b] Οὕτως μεγάλη τὸ βαπτίσματος ἡ δύναμις, &c. οὐκ ἀφίησιν ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ἀνθρώπους. In Acta, Homil. 23.

[c] Διὰ τ τὸ πνεύματος ἐνεργείας τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θείαν τινὰ καὶ ἄῤῥητον ἀναδοχεῖται δύναμιν. In Joan. 3. 5.

[d] Spiritus de cœlis & aquis supereſt, sanctificans eas de ſemetipſo, & ita sanctificatæ vim sanctificandi combibunt. *Tertul.* de Baptiſmo.

[e] Per Baptiſmum Spiritus Sanctus accipitur. D. *Cyprian.* L. 2. Ep. 3.

[f] Chriſtus dedit Aquæ quod dedit Matri, Virtus enim Altiſſimi, & Obumbratio Spiritus Sancti, quæ fecit ut *Maria* pareret Salvatorem; eadem facit ut regeneret Unda Credentem. De Nativ. Dom. Serm. 4.

[b] *Verily*, says St *Chryſoſtom*, *the Power of Baptiſm is great*, &c. *it ſuffers not Men to be Men*; that is, not to be the Men they were by *Nature*.

[c] *By the Energy of the Spirit*, says *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *the ſenſible Water is chang'd into a kind of Divine and unſpeakable Power.*

[d] *The Waters of Baptiſm*, ſaith Tertullian, *being ſanctify'd by the Holy Ghoſt, do conceive a ſanctifying Virtue.*

[e] *By Baptiſm*, ſaith St *Cyprian*, *the Holy Ghoſt is receiv'd.*

[f] *Chriſt*, ſaith St *Leo*, *gave to the Water what he gave to his Mother, for the Virtue of the moſt High and the Overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt, which made* Mary *to bring forth a Saviour; the ſame makes the Water to regenerate a Believer.*

And the Teſtimonies of this nature in the Writings of the *Primitive Fathers*, are almoſt infinite.

The Antient Chriſtians, says the eminently Learned Dr *Patrick*, (now Biſhop of *Ely*) *ſpeak of high Illuminations wherewithal God pleaſed*

pleased them to grace Baptism; and I make no Question, says he, but *they speak as they felt*; and that they talk not of a strange Change *then wrought, which never was.*

And again says he, *By Baptism we are made the Temples of the Holy Ghost, the place where he and nothing else is to inhabit; and being by this Consecrated to him, he likewise when enters upon his Possession, and we are said thereby to receive the Holy Ghost: So that if we run into Sin, we defile his House, and commit the greatest Profaneness and Impiety, and may be said very truly to do despite to the Spirit of God, whereby we are sanctify'd.* And a great deal more of this nature may be seen in his excellent *Discourse concerning Baptism.*

But now, when God promised these Sanctifying Graces of the Holy Spirit, which is the Thing signify'd by the Outward Baptizing with Water, I observ'd that he did it in these Terms; *I will pour on water*, Isa. 44. 3. and, *I will sprinkle clean water upon you*, Ezek. 36. 25. and so he promised, *to sprinkle many nations*, Isai. 52. 15.

And from hence I argued, That if the Cleansing and Sanctifying Graces of the Holy Spirit, which is the Inward Part of Baptism, be well express'd by these *Terms of Pouring and Sprinkling on Water*, then certainly the *Acts of Sprinkling and Pouring on Water*, may very well express and signifie it likewise.

And when this Inward Baptism with the Spirit was promised by God himself in the Prophecy of *Joel*, his words are, *I will pour out my Spirit*, &c. *Joel* 2. 28. *John* the Baptist means the same by his Prophecy; *He* (that is, Christ) *shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.* Matth. 3. 11.

Baptizing with the Holy Ghost, in St *Matthew*, and *Pouring on the Spirit* in *Joel*, signifie the same thing; so that *Baptizing* and *Pouring on*, are Terms equivalent.

For thus, when these Prophecies were fulfilled after an extraordinary manner upon the Day of *Pentecost*; *This*, says St *Peter*, *is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, I will pour out my Spirit*, &c. *Act.* 2. 16, 17. and again, saith St *Peter* speaking of the same thing, *Christ hath shed forth this*; *shed forth*, that is, *poured out*, (ἐξέχεε.) Act. 2. 33.

And thus again, the *Holy Ghost* is said *to fall on Cornelius*, Act. 10. 44. and in the next Verse we read, that *on the Gentiles was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost*; and again says St *Peter*, *The Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning.* Act. 11. 15.

And what was to be understood by this *falling on*, and *pouring on* of the Holy Ghost, he lets us know in the next Verse; *difference*

the Baptism with the Spirit, which St *John* the Baptist foretold that Christ shou'd Baptize withal.

And certainly we may justly gather from all this, That when the Outward Rite of Baptism is perform'd by *sprinkling*, or *pouring on Water*; it is a true and fit Resemblance of that Inward Baptism with the Spirit, which is so constantly exprest by *falling on*, *shedding forth*, or *pouring on*.

I may add, That *Sprinkling with Water* has been Commanded by God himself, as a fit Resemblance of that Inward and Spiritual Cleansing, which was chiefly and principally aim'd at by that External Rite. See *Numbers* 8. 7. and 19. 19.

This Argument in my Letter was farther illustrated with some clear Passages out of our *Common-Prayer-Book*. To which Dr *Russel* very cleverly answers, That the *Common-Prayer-Book* is of no Authority with him, being *the Mass-Book translated into English*; for which false and malicious Aspersion thrown upon the *Common-Prayer-Book*, I will turn him over to Mr *Tombes* for Castigation.

* "I cannot but judge, that either much Ignorance, or much "Malice it is that makes any traduce the *English* Common-Prayer "Book, as if it were the *Popish* Mass-Book, "or as bad as it; and to deterr Men from "joyning with those Prayers and Services "therein which are good, as if it were "joyning with *Antichrist* the *Pope*; (when they can hardly "be ignorant, that the Martyrs in Queen *Mary*'s Days were "Burnt for's) is impudent Falshood.

* Mr *Tombes*'s Theodulia, *p.* 102.

Dr *Russel* answers all the rest of my Letter, by throwing Dirt at it and me; he calls it *an empty and insignificant Letter*; and falls furiously upon me with all the most envenom'd Weapons of his Indignation, with his flippant and declamatory Rhetorick, his ironical and abusive Taunts, his light and freakish Pedantry, his coarse and rustick Compliments.

He disdainfully tramples upon me with the *shrewd Suspicion of my being no Scholar*, and scornfully attacks me in the Magisterial Style of *Thou* and *Thee*. He calls me very learnedly and rhetorically, *an ignorant and illeterat Man*, so he mispels *illiterate*.

Excuse me, you who are Judges of Controversie, that I take notice of such little things as the Mistake of a *Figure* or a *Letter*, which (if candidly Construd) wou'd rather be imputed to an *Erring Press*, than to an *Author*: And I do here profess, that I have no other Design in it, than to let my Antagonist see how little Reason he has so critically to remark, and so unmercifully to animadvert, (as (now he

he has done) upon the like inconsiderable *Errata*, in some *Figures* and *Letters* in my Book.

But I have not yet done with his Railery. He repeats it again and again, that I am *a False Accuser*, and says of me, that *I rave and rage, and am at my Wits end.* And to discover his Breeding and his Manners, he tells me that *I speak Lies*; and uses abundance of Words, to let the World see, that he is at the utmost distance from that Archangelical Temper, which durst not make use of a Railing Accusation, *Jude* 9.

He tells us indeed in the *Dedication* of his *Narative of the* Portsmouth-*Disputation*, that *he sent to Mr.* Robinson, (one of his *Presbyterian* Antagonists) *to let him know, that he took it unkindly at his Hands, that he shou'd be so abusive, as to give the Lye.* So that to give the Lye, in the Doctor's own judgment, is to be abusive.

And let me freely tell you, Sir, that your ill Words have rais'd a shrewd Suspicion in many, that you had a bad Cause to defend, and that you have even amongst your own Friends lost much of the Esteem which they formerly had for you; some of them having very generously declar'd, that they are extremely scandaliz'd at your abusive and unchristian way of Writing.

And I will be so much your Friend as to acquaint you farther, that one of your Books falling into the Hands of an ingenious Gentleman, he was so offended at your filthy Style, and scurrilous Language, that he blotted out of your Title-Page, *Ex Acad. Cantabrig.* and set down in the place, *Ex Billingsgate.*

And what was the matter that stirr'd up the Doctor's Choler, and made his Spleen swell to this degree of Bitterness? Why truly I had charg'd the Author of a little Book (call'd, *The Reason*, &c.) with Mirth and Mockery, and had said, that it was *merrily and in sport and rallery, that he call'd our way of Baptizing, by Sprinkling, Rantizing.*

And I do here confess indeed, that I did so charge that Author, and am still perswaded, that it was for the sake of the Jingle, and of that resemblance in Sound, which is between *Baptizing* and *Rantizing*, that he so *call'd* our Mode of *Baptizing.*

No, says Dr *Russel*, the Man was not so sportive and gamesom, but very demure and grave, and when he said that your way of *Baptizing* by *Sprinkling* was *Rantizing*, he meant in very serious earnest, that *Sprinkling was Sprinkling.*

And the Doctor seconds him, and affirms it in these peremptory Words, that *Rantism is Sprinkling, and Sprinkling is Rantism, say thou what thou wilt*: And he will have us to know, that this is not Jest, but Earnest, for says he, *There is no dif-*

ſerves between the two Words, but only one is Greek, and the other English.

Why then, when *C. D.* and this Doctor ſay, that *Sprinkling is Rantizing*, and *Rantizing* is *Sprinkling*; all that they mean by it is this, *viz.* With great Gravity and Seriouſneſs to inſtruct the ignorant World, that *Sprinkling is Sprinkling*, and *Sprinkling is Sprinkling*, which is perfect Fooleryy; and puts me in mind of a Story that's told of one D^r *Ruſſel*, (as he call'd himſelf,) a Mountebank, who telling the Virtue of his *Scorbutic Drops*, and being ask'd by a plain Country-man what *Scorbutick* meant; *Scorbutic is Scorbutic*, ſaid he; What ſhou'd it be elſe but *Scorbutia*?

And now, whether *C. D.* will acknowledge the Sport and Mockery that I chang'd him withal, or this groſs Foolery which D^r *Ruſſel* makes him guilty of, I leave to his own choice. And ſo I paſs on to my *Second Letter*.

A Juſt Vindication of LETTER II.

IN this Letter I attempt to anſwer the Objection againſt the Mode of Baptizing by *ſprinkling*, or *pouring on Water*; which is raiſed from the Word (Βαπτίζω *oſſes*) *Baptizing*; which our Adverſaries do confidently ſay, does always ſignifie *Dipping*.

In anſwer whereunto, I took notice, that "Dr *Patrick* (now "Biſhop of *Ely*) obſerves to us, That Mr *Pocock* hath largely "ſhewn that, (Βαπτίζεσθαι) to be Baptized, does not always "ſignifie among the *Jews*, the waſhing of the whole Body.

And from hence D^r *Ruſſel* concludes, that *In my Opinion, the Biſhop had not Skill, nor Learning enough to give us the meaning of this* Greek *Word himſelf, but ſends his Reader to one* Pocock, *a Man of an Inferior Order, to reſolve it for him: And ſurely*, ſays he, *your Dioceſan has no cauſe to thank you for this.* And again, ſays he, *How ſtrangely has this weak-headed Prieſt repreſented this Learned Biſhop to the World?*

Sir, I regard not the Indignity and Contempt that you put upon me; Rudeneſs and Incivility offer'd to my ſelf, is what I can patiently bear with, and I have learnt to expect no better from you.

But that a Perſon of ſuch Learning and Worth, as Mr *Pocock* was, whom *the Univerſity of* Oxford thought worthy of *one of*

the

the highest Chairs in their Theatre, that such a great Man should be so disdainfully spoke of, and mention'd so rudely and clownishly as you mention him, calling him *one* Pocock, *a Man of an Inferior Order*; this shews how little you understand of the *Breeding* either of a *Scholar* or of a *Gentleman*.

You have told us in your *Dedication* of your *Narrative of the* Portsmouth *Disputation*, that *you know not what reason your* Presbyterian *Antagonists had to refuse to give you the Civil Title of Doctor*.

'Tis but reason and civility, that you forsooth should be intitled *Doctor*; but where then, Dr *Russel*, is your reason and civility, when you so commonly refuse to give any *Civil Title* to others? You have notoriously transgrest against that equitable Rule of *doing as you would be done by*, and have therefore *made work for Repentance*, as you love to phrase it.

Again, How perversly have you concluded, that *in my Opinion the Bishop of* Ely *had not Skill, nor Learning enough to give us the signification of this* Greek *Word himself*?

Suppose Sir, that a Man shou'd say, that you from a certain Author have given us an Account of the Abuses of Baptism in the Church of *Rome*, wou'd it be fairly done, shou'd any one conclude from hence, that in that Man's Opinion you had not Skill, nor Learning enough your self, to translate a little sorry *Latin* out of the Romish *Ritual* and *Mass-Book*, but you was beholden to another Author for it?

My Design was, to shew the Bishop of *Ely*'s Opinion of the Signification of the word (βαπτίζουσι) *Baptizing*; and certainly his making that Note in the Margin of his Book, may let us understand that he was throly satisfied with Mr *Pocock*'s Proofs, and agreed with him in it, that (βαπτίζουσι) *Baptizing does not always signifie the Washing of the whole Body*?

And whereas you say, that *I wou'd make you believe that the Bishop said not one Word to it himself*. This is a gross Mistake of yours; when I told you, that he not only said, that Mr *Pocock had largely prov'd it*, but that he also added, that *it was to be observed against those who now make it necessary*.

Which Words indeed, to lessen the Authority of them, you falsly say are mine; and your Mistake was pardonable perhaps, 'till you procur'd the Bishop's Book; but when you had the Book before your Eyes, to let such a seen and known Falshood pass uncorrected into the World, 'tis an Argument, that you will say any thing to serve a Turn.

But now I must prepare my self to encounter an heavy Accusation, Dr *Russel* arraigns me before the Bishop of *Ely*, and lays it to my Charge, that *I have wronged both his Lordship and Mr.* Pocock.

And

And wherein was this great Wrong done? Why truly I had left out the *Hebrew* word *Tabal*, and did not take notice that Mr *Pocock* had largely prov'd, (as indeed he has) as well concerning the *Hebrew* Word as the *Greek*, that it does not always ſignifie *Dipping*.

And this is a wonderful Wrong indeed, when I was inquiring into the Signification of a *Greek* Word, to overlook the *Hebrew*! However, if by any means I may pleaſe this tethy Doctor, I wou'd now give him the Biſhop's words at length. *Mr.* Pocock *hath largely ſhewn, that* טבל *and* βαπτίζεσθαι *do not ſignifie among the Jews always the Waſhing of the whole Body; which is to be obſerv'd, againſt thoſe that make it now neceſſary.* Not. Miſcel. cap. 9.

To which D^r *Ruſſel* does at length reply, *that the Inſtance is impertinent*; for ſays he, *we are not now diſputing about* Jewiſh *Ceremonies, but about the Goſpel-Ordinance of Chriſtian Baptiſm.*

Which Saying is both impertinent and falſe; for we are neither diſputing about *Jewiſh* Ceremonies, nor yet in this place about the Goſpel-Ordinance of Chriſtian Baptiſm; but are only enquiring into the bare Signification of the word βαπτίζουσι.

In his pretended *Examination* and *Confutation* of the reſt of this *Letter*, he does ſo circle it about, and run backwards and forwards to bewilder and loſe his Readers, that I muſt have the Trouble of looking about for his Objections, 'till I can find them.

I thus proceeded: "If I might be Sophiſtical, and play with "Particles, as it is the manner of our Adverſaries to do, I might "here obſerve of our Pious and Learned Tranſlators, that they "do not ſeem to underſtand Dipping by Baptizing; for in our "*Engliſh* Bibles which they have put into our Hands, we uſually "read of Baptizing *with* Water; where by *Baptizing* we cannot "eaſily underſtand *Dipping*, becauſe Dipping *with* Water is not "good ſenſe.

And here *Dr.* Ruſſel *will know no reaſon why I call them Adverſaries, unleſs it be for their telling me the Truth*; which is a very great *Untruth* indeed; for I never yet found ſo much *Truth* in their Words: And to be plain with you, Sir, I call you *Adverſaries* for the ſame Reaſon that you call us *Antagoniſts*, in your *Epiſtle to the Reader.*

You next ſuppoſe that I ſpeak it by *hear-ſay*, when I affirm that it *is the manner of our Adverſaries to play with Particles.* But to ſhew you, that in this Suppoſition *you do not tell me the Truth*; You may look into your Friend M^r *Fiſher's*

* *Pag.* 325. † *p.* 8. * Book, and into a vain † Book, call'd, *The Vanity*

Vanity of Childiſh Baptiſm; and there you may *ſee* what I affirm'd *with your Eyes*; (as I did) which is more than *Hear-ſay*.

You then obſerve, that *I do not tell you how it is in the* Greek. What, Sir, did our Tranſlators tranſlate the *Greek Teſtament* into *Greek*. I was noting from their *Engliſh Tranſlation*, what I judg'd they underſtood the meaning of the word βαπτίζουσες to be; and therefore your Obſervation, that to ſhew our Tranſlators Opinion, I do not tell you how it is in the *Greek*, is only *a perverſe way of talking*; if you will allow of your own Words.

I added from *Mark* 7. 4. where it is ſaid of the *Jews*, that *when they come from the market, they eat not except they waſh*, (or *are baptized*, according to the Original) that there, by *Baptized* we are not neceſſarily to underſtand *Dipped*; for as Mr *Pocock* has abundantly prov'd, the *Jews* at their return from the Market, did not always Waſh or *Dip* the whole Body.

Again, I ſhew'd from *Luke* 11. 38. that the whole Perſon is ſaid to be *Waſhed* (or *Baptized*, according to the Original) when only his Hands are waſhed with Water, and that too (as Mr *Pocock* has prov'd) by having Water *poured upon* them: But this Dr *Ruſſel* was pleas'd to overlook.

I likewiſe obſerv'd, That 'tis ſaid of the *Iſraelites* that came out of *Egypt*, that they were all *Baptized* in the Cloud and in the Sea; whereas they were not *Dipt* into the Cloud, or into the Sea; but were only *Sprinkled*, or Daſhed upon, *&c.*

But *this* the Doctor *will not let paſs* without a ſharp *Reproof* given me, for ſaying the Cloud and the Sea did ſprinkle or daſh them as they went thro': For ſays he, *this is to deceive your Reader by adding to the Word of God, for it is not ſo written therein.*

But really, Sir, *you do err, not knowing the Scriptures.* For the Pſalmiſt ſpeaking of the *Iſraelites* paſſing thro' the *Red Sea*, ſays expreſly, that *the clouds poured out water*, Pſal. 77. 17. *the Clouds poured out Water*, and ſo *they were Baptized in the Cloud and in the Sea*, by having Water *poured upon them.*

I farther obſerv'd, That when the Apoſtles *were Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt*, the Holy Ghoſt did not deſcend like a River of Flame for the Apoſtles to be dipt into, but was ſaid only to be *poured upon* them.

To which Dr *Ruſſel* thus replies, *The Houſe being filled with the Spirit, where the Apoſtles were ſitting, as of a mighty ruſhing Wind*; they were *as much environ'd with the Holy Ghoſt*, as a *Perſon that is dipt in Water.*

Well ſaid, Reprover! and *to your Shame and Reproach*, muſt your Reproof now return upon your own Head. *This is to deceive your Reader, by adding to the Word of God.* The

The Word of God does not say that *the House was filled with the Holy Ghost*, but *with the sound of a rushing mighty wind*; which Sound was not the Holy Ghost, for the Sound was not *shed forth* or *poured on* upon the Apostles, as St *Peter* says expresly that the Holy Ghost was.

St *Peter* says, that the Holy Ghost was *shed forth* upon the Apostles, Dr *Russel* says that the Holy Ghost *environ'd them*; St *Peter* says, that the Holy Ghost was *poured out* upon the Apostles; Dr *Russel* wou'd have us believe that they were in a manner *Dipt* into't. But let them believe Dr *Russel* that can. I must and will believe St *Peter*.

And farther, I observ'd, that the Primitive Fathers call'd *Sprinkling* with Water, *Baptizing* with Water; as in the case of the *Clinici*, who were said to be (βαπτιζόμενοι ἐν τῇ κλίνῃ) *Baptized* upon their Beds of Sickness; when 'tis undeniable, that they were only *Sprinkled* with Water.

To which Dr *Russel* gives a double Answer: First, That *he does not value what Men call Baptizing*; he has no regard to these Men's Words, as he contemptuously calls the Primitive Fathers: But really, Sir, when I find these Primitive Saints so freely denominating and calling *Sprinkling Baptizing*, I shall not need to value what you have said, or can say to the contrary. But,

Secondly, You answer in some Words of Bishop *Taylor*.

And because you make wonderful use of that Bishop's Name, and are at every turn appealing to his Books, and lay great Stress upon his Authority, I will here once for all discover the Abuse which you put upon him, and how extremely you wrong that celebrated Author with a most wretched Misapplication of his Words.

Sir, you serve him just as that *Demonstrating Writer of the Church of* Rome, Mr *John Serjeant* did. The good Bishop indeed had pleaded the Cause of the *Papists*, as well as of the *Anabaptists*; he had said as much for *Popery*, and as much for *Anabaptism*, as they wou'd bear; but in what sense, and for what reason, and upon what occasion he became their Advocate, I will now make manifest in his own Words.

Mr *Serjeant* had made the same Use of his Plea for the *Papists*, that you do of his Plea for the *Anabaptists*; and therefore his Answer to Mr *Serjeant* will be a good Answer to *you* too, and 'tis this.

* *Now in my Conscience*, saith the Bishop, *this was unkindly done, that when I had spoken for them what I could, and more than I knew they had ever said for themselves, to save them harmless from the Iron Hands*

* Dissuas. from Popery, *Part* II. *Introduction.*

Hands of a Tyrant and unreasonable Power, and to keep them from being persecuted for their Errors and Opinions. 'Twas unkindly done, *to take the Arms which I had lent them for their Defence, and throw them at my Head. But the best of it is, tho' J. S. be unthankful, yet the Weapons themselves are but Wooden Daggers, intended only to represent how the poor Men are cozen'd by themselves, and that under fair and fraudulent Pretences; even pious well-meaning Men, Men wise enough in other things, may be abus'd. And tho' what I said was but Tinsel and Pretence, Imagery and Whipt Cream, yet I cou'd not be blamed to use no better than the best their Cause wou'd bear.* —— *And for their Comfort, they might have observ'd in that Book, that there is not half so much Excuse for the* Papists, *as there is for the* Anabaptists; *and yet it was but an Excuse at the best.* —— *But since from me they borrow their light Armour, which is not Pistol-proof, from me if they please, they may receive a Remedy to undeceive them.*

And thus you see, Sir, tho' the Bishop said more for you than for the *Papists*, yet all was but Excuse; he pleaded for your Opinions, not to represent them as *true*, but only as *tolerable*: And all this to preserve you from being persecuted for your *Errours*; for after all that he has said, he owns the Arguments to be but *Tinsel* and *Whipt Cream*, thin and frothy, tho' fair and plausible enough for some Men to be cozen'd withal; and you may observe, that he still calls you *Anabaptists*.

And I will add, that what he said to *J. S.* may with equal reason and truth be apply'd to *you*; *viz.* That *since from the Bishop you have receiv'd your Arguments, from him, if you please, you may receive Answers to undeceive you.* And this I doubt not to shew, as oft as I meet with your Quotations out of his Books.

And here I will particularly consider what you answer in the Bishop's words against that *Clinick-Baptism*, which was by *Sprinkling*.

Immersion was of so sacred an Account in their esteem, (meaning the Fathers of that time, when Clinick-Baptism was used by some) that they did not esteem it lawful to receive him into the Clergy, who had been Sprinkled in Baptism; as we learn from the Epistle of Cornelius *to* Fabianus *of* Antioch, *(as in* Eusebius, lib. 6. cap. 43.) *it is not lawful that he who is Baptized in his Bed by reason of Sickness, shou'd be admitted to Holy Orders; doubting whether such a Sprinkling shou'd be call'd Baptism: And therefore* Magnus *in his Epistle questions whether they are to be esteemed right Christians, who are only sprinkled, and not dipt in Water.* To which I answer,

First, I will not deny, but that there might even then be some such Ecclesiastical *Law* or *Canon* against the *Clinicks*, as *Cornelius*

ſeems to allude to; tho' *when*, or *where*, or *by whom*, or *in what words* it was made, I cou'd never yet learn.

The firſt Canon that I meet with of that nature, is that of the *Neocæſarian Council*, in the beginning of the next Century, about the Year 313, whereby the *Clinicks*, if they recover'd, were render'd *ordinarily* (ſays Dr * *Cave*) *incapable of being admitted to the Degree of Preshyters in the Church.*

* *Primitive Chriſtianity*, pag. 308, 309.

† But, *Not becauſe of any Unlawfulneſs in the Manner of their Baptiſm*, (as Dr *Towerſon* has well obſerv'd) *but becauſe there was ſometimes a Preſumption that that Baptiſm proceeded rather from Neceſſity than Choice; and that they had*, as Tertullian *ſpeaks*, *deferred the receiving it; that they might in the mean time indulge to their Sins; as nothing doubting, but that their future Baptiſm wou'd wipe off all.*

† Dr. Towerſon *of Baptiſm*, p. 62.

The Caſe in ſhort was this: They who in their Health had refus'd to be Baptiz'd, that they might (as they thought) be at the greater Liberty to enjoy their Sins, tho' theſe Men in their Sickneſs, and under the Fears of Death, wou'd reſolve to forſake their Sins, and deſire to be *Baptized* by *Sprinkling*; yet when they recover'd, becauſe their Sick-bed Reſolutions (as it but too uſually happens) might probably wear off, and they return to their Sins again: Therefore it was upon this Preſumption of the Danger of a Relapſe, that they were not *ordinarily* allow'd to be promoted to the Prieſthood.

And thus it was not their *Baptiſm by Sprinkling*, that was objected againſt them; but their *Delay of Baptiſm, till they thought themſelves a Dying.* The Church was jealous of the ſincerity and truth of their Engagements to lead a Chriſtian Life, who wou'd not engage ſo to do till they were Bed-rid. And therefore I ſay it was, that theſe Baptized *Clinicks* were not *ordinarily* thought fit to be made Prieſts of. Ordinarily I ſay again, for in ſome Caſes they were; as when after their Recovery they gave good Proof of their Orthodox Lives and Religion, *&c.* But,

Secondly, To give a more particular Anſwer to what is alledg'd from *Cornelius*'s Epiſtle to *Fabian.*

The true Account of which Matter was this. One *Novatus* (by ſome call'd *Novatianus*) had been *Sprinkled*, and *ſo Baptized* upon his Bed of Sickneſs, in the time of *Fabian* Biſhop of *Rome*; and after the Recovery of the ſaid *Novatus*, *Fabian* wou'd have made him Prieſt, and tho' he met with ſome Oppoſition, yet at laſt he prevail'd, and Ordain'd him.

After *Fabian*'s Death, and a Vacancy in that See for above a Year, tho' *Novatianus* wou'd have thruſt himſelf in, yet *Cornelius* was elected Biſhop of *Rome*; and this *Cornelius* oppos'd and condemn'd *Novatian*.

And now I obſerve, that even Biſhop *Taylor* himſelf, becauſe of the Difference between *Cornelius* and *Novatus*, ſeems to intimate a Suſpicion, that what *Cornelius* ſaid of *Clinick Baptiſm*, was ſpoken *in Diminution of* Novatus, *and Indignation againſt his Perſon*. For after the Words of *Cornelius* in Dr *Ruſſel*'s Quotation, it thus follows in Biſhop *Taylor*'s Account; and *this was not only ſpoken in Diminution of* Novatus, *and Indignation againſt his Perſon*; (which Words Dr *Ruſſel* very inſincerely hides from us) *for it was a formal and ſolemn Queſtion* put by *Magnus*, &c.

And here Dr *Ruſſel* leaves Biſhop *Taylor*, as if he had put *Magnus* his Queſtion, and left it as an unanſwerable One; whereas the Biſhop goes on, and anſwers it from St *Cyprian*, and from Authentick Inſtances of *Baptizing* by *Sprinkling* in the Primitive Times; as I ſhall ſhew by and by.

But here I muſt attend to what Dr *Ruſſel* ſays upon this Occaſion. *The firſt*, ſays he, *that ever ſtarted it* (I ſuppoſe he means Baptizing by Sprinkling) *was St.* Cyprian, *and it was oppos'd by* Magnus *as ſoon as mention'd.*

Indeed Sir, you tell the Story backwards; for *Clinick Baptiſm being uſed by ſome*, as your own Words are, *Magnus* (and no Body elſe that I meet with) put his Queſtion about it to St *Cyprian*, and St *Cyprian* gave him an Anſwer, in a moſt excellent *Epiſtle* which he then writ to him: So that St *Cyprian* was not the *firſt Starter* in this Caſe, and *Magnus* the *Oppoſer*; but *Magnus* was the *firſt Queſtioniſt*, and St *Cyprian* the *Reſpondent*.

And have not you, Sir, heard of *Baptizing* by *Sprinkling* till St *Cyprian*'s time, you ſhall hear anon from your own Advocate Biſhop *Taylor*, that *Tertullian* ſpeaks of it; who was ſome Years before St *Cyprian*.

And even in the Apoſtles time, as you argue from ſome Perſons being *Baptized in Rivers*, that they were *Dipt*. With equal Reaſon 'tis argu'd from ſome Perſons being *Baptized in Houſes and in Priſons*, that they were only *Sprinkled*.

And you cannot be ignorant with what great probabilities 'tis concluded by many Learned Perſons, that the three Thouſand People Baptized, *Act.* 2. were Baptized by *Sprinkling*.

And (ſays Dr *Cave*) to the Cuſtom of *Clinick Baptiſm*, which was by Sprinkling, ſome not improbably think the Apoſtle has reference in that famous place, where he ſpeaks of thoſe *who were baptized for the dead*, 1 Cor. 15. 29.

Why are they then Baptized for the Dead? says he, as if he had said, *Why are they then Baptized, who are given over for Dead?* *Epiphanius* † thinks this to be the best Interpretation; and 'tis abetted by *Calvin*: *Qui jam mortui censeantur, & qui de vita omnino desperaverint.*

† Hæres. 28. p. 54.

But certainly then, when these Persons were *Baptized, who were given over for dead*, and past all hopes of recovery, they were not *dipt*, but only *sprinkled*; as all such *Baptized Clinicks* were, and as Dr *Russel* himself confesses they were in St *Cyprian*'s time.

I need not thank him for confessing that *the Clinicks* were then *so Baptiz'd*, for 'tis undeniable; but why then wou'd he repeat it here in his Book? and (lest it shou'd be overlook'd) clap it into his *Title-Page* too in the words of Mr *Mede*, that *there was no such thing as Sprinkling used in Baptism in the Apostles times*, nor many Ages *after them*.

Why are these words *many Ages* printed in a different Character to make them the more observable? For God's sake Sir, in what *Age* did St *Cyprian* live? How many Ecclesiastical *Ages* were there between the *Age of the Apostles*, and *St.* Cyprian's *Age*? indeed but *One*; and what then do you mean by these *many Ages*?

And now that I am looking into your *Title-Page*, I must again complain of you for your unhandsom dealing with *Tilenus*. You say in the words of *Tilenus*, "The outward Rite in Baptism is "Threefold; 1. Immersion into the Water: 2. Abiding under "the Water: 3. Resurrection out of the Water. But why, Sir, do you so disingenuously stop there? for *Tilenus* says farther; "* Altho' Immersion was "formerly more usual, especially in *Judæa* "and other hotter Countries, than Asper- "sion; yet forasmuch as this Circumstance doth not pertain to "the Substance of Baptism, and forasmuch as that in *Sprinkling*, as "well as in *Dipping*, the Analogy of the Sacrament is kept; and "seeing that even in Legal Purifications, Sprinkling did suffice; "and lastly, seeing that Dipping, especially of tender Infants, "who are the most that are now Baptized, is not without danger "of Death. We, like as each Rite is signify'd by the word "Baptism, *Matth.* 3. 16. *Luke* 11. 8. *Mark* 7. 4. even so do we "judge that the Use of them both, *Sprinkling* as well as *Dipping* "may be retain'd in the Church.

* Thes. 15.

And this is the Sense of that Learned Author, which is most insincerely misrepresented by Dr *Russel* in his lame Quotation.

I will

I will add what I find in another place in * *Tilenus*, "*Baptiſm*, "if we regard the *Etymology* of the Word "ſignifies *Immerſion*, and alſo *Sprinkling*; in * Theſi 21. "which ſenſe it is uſed, *Mark* 7. 4.

And now from your Title-Page, I will take this Opportunity to look into your *Epiſtle Dedicatory*; where you hale in Mr *Daniel Rogers*, as bearing a *Notable Teſtimony* (as you call it) *for Dipping, againſt Sprinkling*; and as you have manag'd the Matter, you have made it a Notable Teſtimony indeed: But you have abus'd Mr *Rogers*, by making him ſay, *That the Miniſter is to dip into Water, as the meeteſt Act, the word* βαπτιζω *notes it*: Which are not Mr *Roger's* Words; for Mr *Rogers* ſpeaks thus, *The word* Baptized *ſignifieth the true Act of the Miniſter, to dip the Body, or ſome part of it, into the Water.*

And now, Sir, this is no ſuch Notable Teſtimony for *your Dipping*, as you wou'd have made it to be; for nothing leſs than Dipping the whole Body will ſerve your Turn: Whereas, *to dip ſome part of it* only, is thought to be a true Act of the Baptizing-Miniſter by Mr *Rogers*, as I cou'd here obſerve, that an antient way of Baptizing, was to *dip the Head* only.

But I will take notice of one thing more in your *Epiſtle Dedicatory*; you ſay, we *had formerly large Fonts in our Churches, on purpoſe to Dip the Children therein.*

But, Sir, as for the Way of Baptizing in the Fonts you ſpeak of, we may underſtand what it was by that *Greek Inſcription* upon one of them, * mention'd by Biſhop *Taylor*, which was ſo prettily contriv'd, that the Words might be read after the *Greek*, or after the *Hebrew* manner, and be exactly the ſame: ΝΙΨΟΝ ΑΝΟΜΗΜΑ ΜΗ ΜΟΝΑΝ ΟΨΙΝ. Lord, *Waſh my Sin, and not my* Face *only.*

* *Great Exemp.* p. 180.

And now having got to Biſhop *Taylor* again, I muſt not forget an Anſwer to *Magnus* his Queſtion, *Whether they are to be eſteemed right Chriſtians, who are only Sprinkled, and not Dipt in Water.*

And in the firſt place I will take notice, that *Magnus* his own Words are theſe; *An habendi ſint Chriſtiani legitimi, eo quod Aquâ ſalutari non lotiſunt, ſed perfuſi:* Which I thus render; *Whether they are to be eſteemed right Chriſtians, who are only ſprinkled, and not waſhed with Water.*

Now to this Queſtion St *Cyprian* very fully anſwers, and I had once thought to have added in this place a Tranſlation of that whole Epiſtle, but this *Vindication* of my *Second Letter* having already ſwell'd into a length beyond my Intention, I will only obſerve,

observe, that we are assured by that Learned Father, That God himself hath signally owned his Holy Ordinance of Baptism, when administer'd by *Sprinkling*.

For, says he, *They who had been so Baptized, were known to have been delivered thereby from that unclean Spirit which before possest them; and after their recovery gave as good Proof as any, by their Holy Living, of their being Sanctified by that Baptism.*

And to shew that the generality of the Christian Church thought Dipping or Sprinkling to be equally valid, he tells us, *it was never enquired* concerning the Baptized, *Whether they were Wash'd or Sprinkled, Clinicks or Peripateticks.*

And Bishop *Taylor* does himself inform us, (a little after the Words quoted by Dr *Russel*) that this Mode of Baptizing by Sprinkling *was countenanc'd by Good Examples in the best Times.*

Tertullian, says he, *speaks thus*, Quis enim tibi tam infidæ pœnitentiæ viro Asperginem unam cujuslibet Aquæ commodabit? *Who will afford thee so much as one single Sprinkling of Water? meaning for Baptism.*

And he adds, that *Surius* in the Life of St *Laurence* tells, that *as he was going to Martyrdom, one* Romanus *a Soldier brought to him a Pitcher of Water, that he might be Baptized of him as he went; which in that Case must needs have been done by pouring Water upon him*; Fudit Aquam super Caput ejus: *So did St.* Laurence *also to* Lucillus, *he poured Water upon his Head.*

And *elsewhere, speaking of the Antients, *They Baptized*, says he, *in Rivers or in Lavatories, by Dipping or by Sprinkling; for so we find St.* Laurence *did as he went to Martyrdom, and so the Church did sometimes to Clinicks, and so it is highly convenient to be done in Northern Countries; according to that Prophecy of* Isaiah, *So shall he sprinkle many nations*, Isai. 52. 15. *And it is fairly relative to the Mystery, to the sprinkling with the blood of Christ*, 1 Pet. 1. 2. *And to the Watering of the Furrows of our Souls with the Dew of Heaven, to make them bring forth Fruit unto the Spirit, and unto Holiness.*

* *Great Exemplar*, p. 213.

In short, As the Forms of *Words* in the Administration of Baptism have been various in various Churches, sometimes the Minister saying, *I Baptize thee*, as in the *Latin* Church; sometimes, *Let the Servant of God be Baptized*; or, *He is Baptized*; which are severally used in the *Greek* and other Churches.

Even so in the Christian Church have *the Modes* of Baptizing been very different and various. Sometimes the Person Baptized was *Dipped once*, sometimes *thrice*; sometimes the Head only was *Dipped once*; or *thrice*, as is evident from those words of

* St *Hierom*,

* St *Hierom*, *In Lavacro ter mergitare Caput.* And how Baptiſm hath been adminiſtred by *ſprinkling* or *pouring on* Water, has been my Buſineſs at this time more particularly to ſhew.

* *Adverſ. Lucifer.*

The Miniſter Baptizes the Child, *Dipping* or *Sprinkling* it; *either of which is ſufficient*, ſays the admirably Learned Biſhop † *Sparrow*; and for this, he referrs to the 74th *Dogma* of *Gennadius*.

† *Rationale*, p. 298.

And now having made it appear, both *by Scripture* and *Primitive Interpretation* and *Practice*, that (βαπτίζοντες) *Baptizing*, ſignifies *Waſhing* as well by *ſprinkling* or *pouring on* Water, as by *dipping*; I may conclude, that D^r *Ruſſel* is in an *Errour*, when he confines the ſignification of it to *Dipping only*.

Juſt as when I had put the plain Caſe of paying the *ſame Sum* either in *Gold* or in *Silver*, D^r *Ruſſel* will have the Sum to be *ten Guinea's*; as if the ten Guinea's *in ſpecie* might be paid in Silver, as well as in Gold.

And again, when I ſpoke of paying the *ſame Sum*, he divides it into *two* very unequal ones, *ten Guinea's* and *ten Pence*. But this is his way, when he is pinch'd with an Argument, either lightly to skip it over, or elſe to fall foul upon't with Banter and Buffoonry.

If he gives us a true Account of the *Dutch Tranſlation*, we have the *Practice* of thoſe *Tranſlators* to confute them, and to ſhew that they were not ſo *honeſt* or ſo skilful as they ſhou'd have been, and as our *Engliſh Tranſlators* were, whatſoever this Doctor inſinuates to the contrary.

When the *Wine* in the other Sacrament is ſpoken of, it wou'd not be honeſtly done, ſhou'd one interpret the word ſo as to ſignifie no leſs than *a whole Flagonful*. Even ſo, ſeeing that the word βαπτίζοντες ſignifies *ſprinkling* or *pouring on* Water as well as *dipping*; it is not honeſtly done, to tranſlate it ſo as to ſignifie no leſs than a *total dipping*.

D^r *Ruſſel* concludes his *Remarks* upon my *Second Letter* with the words of Dr *Cave*, that *the Party baptiz'd was wholly immerg'd or put under Water*: And of Mr *Baxter*, *It is commonly confeſt by us to the* Anabaptiſts, *that in the Apoſtles time the Baptized were dipt over Head in Water*.

Well, Sir, Dr *Cave* and Mr *Baxter* ſay that Dipping was an antient way of Baptizing, but they do not ſay that it was the *only* antient way; they were not ſo ignorant of the Primitive Practice in this Caſe: And had you plaid the Honeſt Man, and given us Dr *Cave*'s words without mincing them, you had told us the

the whole Truth, which now you do not: For the very next words to those which you have pickt out of Dr *Cave*'s *Primitive Christianity*, are these, *which was the* almost *constant and universal Custom of those Times.*

Thus you see, Sir, that according to Dr *Cave*, Dipping was but the *almost* constant Custom of those Times; and in the very next Page he shews, that even *In the same Times they did not hold Sprinkling to be unlawful, especially in Cases of Necessity; as of Weakness, danger of Death, or where conveniency of Immerging cou'd not be had: In these, and such-like Cases,* Cyprian *does not only allow, but plead for it, and that in a Discourse on purpose, when the Question concerning it was put to him. Upon this Account it is, that Immersion is now generally disus'd in these Parts of the World, and Sprinkling succeeded in its room; because the tender Bodies of most Infants, the only Persons now Baptiz'd, cou'd not be put under Water in these cold Northern Climates, without apparent prejudice to their Health, if not their Lives; and therefore in this, as in other Cases,* God requires Mercy rather than Sacrifice.

And now, Sir, Is it thus that you have fully Demonstrated the Necessity of *Dipping*, from the Pens of divers of our own Learned Doctors and Bishops, as you promised to do in your *Epistle Dedicatory?* I'll here take the Freedom briefly to remark how you have dealt both with your *Learned Witnesses*, and with their *Evidence.*

Sometimes in a good Humour you are pleas'd to call them, *The Bishops and Learned Clergy of the Church of* England, (*p.* 121.) and, *The Bishops and Doctors of the Church of* England, (*p.* 127.) But then again in your sullen and angry Mood, you declare and denounce them *to all be Unchurch'd, and their Church to be no Church,* (*p.*111.) So that according to your Contradiction and Nonsence, they are *The Unchurch'd Church-Men of the Church and no Church of* England.

And then to gain Credit to their Testimony, which you say they bear to your Practice, let us hear what you have said for their Reputation and Sincerity. Why truly you tell us, *They are under a grand Infatuation*, and that *They are bewitch'd*; for that's the meaning of your *Greek*, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανε; (*p.* 49.) and again, you very mannerly tell us, that *They are a Party who make no Conscience of telling Lies in the Name of the Blessed Trinity.* (*p.*99.) And again, like a well-bred Gentleman, you tell us, that *They are Deceivers of the People, and tell Lies in the Name of the Lord.* (*p.*107.)

And is not this a pleasant Man, and of good Assurance? This is the Genteel, Civil, Sweet Dr *Russel*, who complain'd of Mr *Robinson*, *For being so abusive as to give the Lye.*

Sir,

Sir, ſhou'd any one diſcredit and blacken his own Witneſſes at this mad Rate in any of our Courts of Judicature, he wou'd be thought fit for nothing but to pick Straws in *Bedlam*.

And, How juſtly may you here expect to have your own Words retorted upon your ſelf? *How ſtrangely hath this weak-headed* Anabaptiſt *repreſented theſe Learned Biſhops and Doctors to the World? It ſeems to me no leſs than a great degree of Arrogance, for a Diminutive* Quack *to take upon him at this wicked Rate* to abuſe all the Biſhops and Doctors of our Church without Exception. Indeed, Sir, *'Tis an heavy Charge that you have laid them under; but the beſt on't is, that* your Learned Witneſſes *are not guilty* of any part of it.

All the Lies which you wou'd make them Guilty of, are owing to your ſelf; to your baſe and treacherous dealing with their Evidence; which I am next to remark.

And indeed, Sir, you have dealt with their Evidence, as he did with the Holy Scripture, who wou'd have made it teach *Atheiſm*. In the Scripture, ſaid he, I read that there is no God; and 'tis true, that theſe words are in the Scripture, but they are only part of the Sentence, and ought not to have been divided from the foregoing words; for the whole Sentence is this; *The fool hath ſaid in his heart, there is no God.*

And thus have you miſrepreſented the Mind and Meaning of the Learned Biſhops and Doctors of our Church, by curtailing their Evidence, and (as you nicely expreſs it) *by flapping us in the Mouth* only with a part of it, in your maimed and cripled Citations, as I have already ſhewn to your Shame, and may, I am afraid, find Cauſe enough ſtill farther to ſhew in the following *Vindication* of my *Third Letter*,

---

A Juſt Vindication of LETTER III.

IN my Third Letter I anſwer ſome farther Objections, which I ſaid wou'd be ſufficiently anſwer'd to our Adverſaries, if I ſhew'd, That the Scriptures which they ground them upon, are not ſuch plain and poſitive Texts of Scripture as they call for in the Caſe of Infant-Baptiſm; and therefore deſir'd that it might be remember'd, that *I do in this Letter argue upon our Adverſaries own Principles, and in their own Way*: And upon this I ask'd, *Where they do read in Scripture of any that were*

Baptiz'd by being Dipt; and commanded to be ſo Baptiz'd, and not otherwiſe.

Dr *Ruſſel* takes it for granted, that there is a Command for Dipping; he means, in the Command *to Baptize all Nations*; for he had aforehand made uſe of his *Side-Wind* to bring this in.

But he wretchedly forgets his own way of arguing, he will not allow any *Children* to be meant by *all Nations* in that Text, becauſe no Children are expreſly mention'd; and for the ſame Reaſon he knows that the *Quakers* will not allow any *Water-Baptiſm*, either by *Dipping* or *Sprinkling* to be meant in that Text, becauſe no *Water* is expreſly mention'd.

And indeed as to their ridiculous way of arguing, he and the *Quakers* may ſeem to have ſhak'd Hands; and certain it is, that there are Inſtances of thoſe, who by this way of arguing having firſt been deluded to *Anabaptiſm*, have afterwards upon the ſame Grounds and Principles been drawn away and enticed to the moſt unchriſtian *Quakeriſm* it ſelf.

But they argue from *Mark* 1. 9. that our Saviour himſelf was Dipped when he was Baptized of *John* in *Jordan*: For, ſay they, the Original Words are, ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάνου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην· and may be tranſlated, *He was dipped of John into Jordan.*

Now to this I anſwer'd, that ἐβαπτίσθη does not neceſſarily ſignifie, He was Dipped.

To which Dr *Ruſſel* replies, that *He has demonſtrated the contrary*; and refers his Reader to his Remarks upon my *Second Letter.*

But I hope, that in my *Vindication* of that *Letter* I have largely ſhewn my Reader, that they are mere Cavils and Impertinencies, to which he ſo inſultingly gives the great Name of *Demonſtration.*

And then, as for the words, εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, which our Adverſaries wou'd fain tranſlate *into Jordan*; I anſwer'd, that they have been ſhewn from ſeveral the like Expreſſions in the New Teſtament, that they might be as well tranſlated, *at Jordan.*

But here Dr *Ruſſel* appeals to the Learned, *Who give their Teſtimonies for us*, ſays he. And how, I pray? why ſays he, *They generally tranſlate the words, In Jordan.* And is not this bravely obſerv'd, for a mighty Man of Demonſtration? That the Learned who tranſlate the words, *in Jordan*, are all on their Side who tranſlate the words, *into Jordan?* How will this Man demonſtrate from our Lord's being *Baptized in Jordan*, that he was *Dipped into Jordan?*

Well!

Well! But he denies that the words may be tranſlated, *at Jordan*; or if ſo, it will be as much as to ſay, *in Jordan*. For with a long and tedious Clatter of Words, he will have us to know, that a Man cannot be *at a Place*, either *at Azotus*, or *at Jeruſalem*, or *at Paris*, or *at Amſterdam*, but he muſt be *in thoſe Places*.

And this is another of his wonderful Demonſtrations: Becauſe a Man cannot be *at Paris*, but he muſt be *in it*; therefore if he be at *Jordan*, he muſt be *in it* too: As if no one cou'd be *at a River*, but he muſt be *in it*, yea and over Head and Ears and all; for ſo much his Dipping requires. But really, Sir, I am juſt now interrupted by a Gentleman, who aſſures me, that he has waſh'd his Face *at a River* many a time, and yet was never *in it*.

But ſtill farther, before the Doctor paſſes this, *He vouchſafes to acquaint me for my better Inſtruction, that in a multitude of places in the New Teſtament, εἰς is render'd* into, *and cannot be render'd otherwiſe.*

And to return his Kindneſs, I will acquint him for His better Inſtruction, that, *Mark* 1. 9. the Text now in diſpute, is none of thoſe places.

But now ſo exceedingly was this Gentleman puft up and ſwell'd with his Imaginary Demonſtrations, that he cou'd hold no longer, but burſt out into Triumphant Acclamations, that the Campaign was at an End, that he had won the Field. *Having thus diſcharged my Hands, ſays he, of this Objection, we may, I hope, more quietly for the future affirm, as we have done, That our Saviour was Dipped of* John *(in, or) into the River of* Jordan.

But when he talks of *diſcharging his Hands*, he ſhou'd have ſaid, his *Stomach*; which tho' it was very foul, yet he has, I hope, in a great meaſure *diſcharg'd*; having thrown up ſuch abundance of Filth and Choler, as we have already met with in his Book.

But really, Sir, notwithſtanding your Diſcharge from the Objection which you have very diſhoneſtly forg'd, and taken to your ſelf, the Objection is ſtill in force againſt you, and will be ſo, till you prove that *being in a River*, does neceſſarily imply *being dipt into it*. But how your Demonſtrating Faculty has here fail'd you, has been already ſhewn.

But 'tis farther argu'd by our *Antagoniſts*, (I preſume Dr *Ruſſel* will not quarrel with his own Word) that *our Saviour when he was baptized, went up ſtraightway out of the water.* Mark 1. 10. Matth. 3. 16.

And here I had wonder'd at the Author of the *little Book* above mention'd, for his wild Note upon *Matth.* 3. 16. *Our Lord went down ſo far and deep into the River*, ſays he, *that the Text is expreſs*; *When he was baptized, he went up ſtraightway out of the water. Mark, He went up out of the Water, is the Curious Penning of the Matter by the Holy Ghoſt; to ſhew the conſiderable depth our Lord went into the Water to be Dipt.*

Which is a Note, which I ſaid the *Original* (which is the Curious Penning of the Holy Ghoſt) wou'd not bear; for the Words in the Original are, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, *from the Water*.

But here the Doctor falls a *diſcharging* again, his Stomach is not yet thro'ly eas'd, there's more Filth and Choler to be thrown up ſtill; and one might think, that the very Dregs of his Venom were now poured out upon me; and that I might for the future be at quiet from his Abuſive Scurrility: And therefore in Charity to him and to my Reader, I will paſs over the foulneſs of his rude and unedecated Pen in this place.

But one thing I muſt take notice of, he ſays, that *I wou'd make the World believe, that the Learned Tranſlators of our* Engliſh *Bibles have by a wrong Tranſlation, (as much as in them lies) deceived many thouſands of poor ignorant Souls; and have laid a Foundation for* Anabaptiſm: And again, *He deſires all to take notice, that all that I have charged upon* C. D. *about the word* out, *Out of the Water, falls upon the Learned Tranſlators.*

But in truth, the Charge falls heavy upon *C. D.* and Dr *Ruſſel*, for ſo notoriouſly wreſting the Words of our Tranſlators, as they have here very weakly, not to ſay wickedly, done.

Do the Learned Tranſlators lay ſuch an Emphaſis upon the word *Out*, as Dr *Ruſſel* does? Is the word *Out* in their Tranſlation written in a different Character, as Dr *Ruſſel* writes it, to make it the more Emphatical? Can any but a perverſe Wreſter of the word, make it denote, that *our Lord went into the Water a conſiderable depth, to be Dipt?* The *Engliſh* Tranſlation muſt be rackt and tortur'd, to confeſs ſuch a wild Remark as this.

And therefore, the Thouſands of ignorant Souls that are thus deceiv'd, their Blood will be requir'd at their Deceivers Hands, who wreſt and ſcrue the Scriptures to make them ſpeak as they wou'd have them: And all the Foundation that is here laid for *Anabaptiſm*, is owing to Dr *Ruſſel* and ſome of his Party; who make ſuch Notes and Remarks upon the Words, as our Tranſlators never once thought of, and ſuch as the Original will by no means bear; witneſs their own Friend * Mr *Fiſher*, who tranſlates the words, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, *from the Water*; "Which (as "I ſaid

* Παιδοβαπτίζοντες παιδίζοντες. p. 324.

" I ſaid) can never prove our Lord to have been *in*, but only by " the Water-ſide; for he who goes but from the Water-ſide, goes " up from the Water; becauſe I think that Rivers do always run in the loweſt Ground.'

I ſaid further, that granting that our Bleſſed Lord went into the River to be *Baptized*, yet it will not yet follow, that he was *Dipt*.

Then it ſeems, ſays Dr *Ruſſel*, *our Lord loſt his labour, if he went into the River to be Baptiz'd*, (i. e. *Dipped*) *and came out again before it was done.*

Poor Man! He is ſtill forced to beg the Queſtion; he muſt have *Baptizing* and *Dipping*, to be all one; which, with all his Paſſion, Rudeneſs, Abuſiveneſs, and Ill Language, he will never be able to make good.

But he then asks me, *How I will prove that our Lord was Baptized at all?* I anſwer, That the Text is very plain, that he was *Baptized*; but to argue from thence that he was *Dipped*, is ſuch a Conſequence as will never be proved upon Dr *Ruſſel*'s Principles.

But now, ſays he, *let us hear what your Learned Doctors and others ſay about it?*

And do they tell you that *Dipping* was an Antient and Apoſtolical Way of Baptizing; and don't they tell you too, that *Infant-Baptiſm* was an Apoſtolical Practice?

Your great Advocate Biſhop *Taylor*, in the very place where he pleads the Antiquity of Dipping, he ſays, that the Antients immerg'd or Dipped the *Catechumen* or the *Infant*.* * *Ductor Dubitantium*, p. 644.

And therefore if we muſt yield to his Authority, we muſt do ſo in both Caſes. Or, if you diſallow it in the Caſe of *Infant-Baptiſm*, for the ſame Reaſon muſt I diſallow it in the Caſe of *Dipping*; for you may remember, that I am now arguing upon your own Principles.

But farther, I have formerly diſcover'd how little you are to be to be truſted in your Quotations out of Learned Mens Books; and I think you had little reaſon to appeal again to Biſhop *Taylor*, Dr *Cave*, and Mr *Baxter*, as you here do; for I have already given an Account of your unworthy Miſrepreſentation of their Minds and Meaning.

And I will but now examine One or two of your Authorities more; and will leave it to the Reader to judge by theſe, of your Sincerity in the reſt.

You appeal to Dr *Hammond*, as if he wou'd allow of no Baptiſm but by *Dipping*; and yet I am ſure he has taught me in his

his *Practical Catechiſm*, that *Baptizing* by *Sprinkling* is likewiſe allowable and valid.

Biſhop *Nicholſon* is another of your Authors, who in his *Expoſition of the Church-Catechiſm* (you ſay) *ſpeaks thus: The Antient Manner of Batizing was the putting the Perſon Baptized under Water, and then taking him out again.*

But, Sir, that Biſhop does not ſay that this was the *only* Antient Way of Baptizing; for but two Leaves before, I find him thus diſcourſing.

" The Ceremony us'd in Baptiſm, is *Dipping* or *Sprinkling*.

" Our Church makes the Action indifferent, whether it be " *Immerſio* or *Aſperſio*, *Dipping* or *Sprinkling*, is left to Diſcretion; " for neither are eſſential to Baptiſm, but belonging to the Cere- " mony of it; and therefore are to be regulated by Charity.

And then having added much-what the ſame Words before quoted, he thus proceeds;

" When the Goſpel was ſpread into colder Regions, Sprinkling " inſtead of Dipping was thought ſufficient; to which that place " of the *Hebrews*, 12. 24. gives Countenance, where mention is " made of the Bloud of Chriſt, and the Bloud of *Sprinkling*; and " again, *Sprinkling of the Bloud of Jeſus Chriſt*, 1 Pet. 1. 2.

" And indeed, I ſee no reaſon, that as in the other Sacrament " a Spoonful of Wine is as ſignificative as a greater Quantity; ſo " here, a Handful of Water ſhou'd not be as ſignificative as a " whole River.

" Farther, this Cuſtom of *Sprinkling* is of great Antiquity, as " appears by the 76th Epiſtle of St *Cyprian*, the latter part of " which is written in defence of it. *Tertullian* alſo (*de Penit.* " *c.* 6.) ſpeaking of Baptiſm, calls it, *Aquæ unam Aſperginem*, *the* " *One Sprinkling of Water*; and *Gregory the Great* acknowledgeth, " it was in uſe in the Weſtern Church. There are who conceive " probably, that the Apoſtles themſelves uſed *Sprinkling* as well " as *Dipping*; ſince we read of ſome Baptized by them in Houſes, " as well as in Rivers.

And after all this, Cou'd Dr *Ruſſel* have the Face to bring in this Learned Biſhop for a Witneſs againſt Baptizing by *Sprinkling*? It ſhall be to me a Caution, never to take any one's Opinion upon this Doctor's Words for the future.

Sir, you are diſcover'd, and muſt not hereafter make ſuch a Bluſter as hitherto you have done with the Biſhops and Doctors of our Church; they are not ſo much for you, as you vainly boaſt to the World. Nay let them but be heard to ſpeak the whole Truth, and I deſire no better Evidence.

And

And now to proceed: " I had obſerv'd of our Lord and " others, that we read of to have been Baptiz'd, that we find not " the leaſt Hint of any of their Cloaths being put off; whereas, " if they had been dipt naked, or if they had but put off ſome of " their uppermoſt Garments, we ſhou'd certainly have heard " ſomething of it; for we are told of our Lord's laying aſide his " Garment upon a leſs Occaſion, *Joh.* 13. 4.

" But now we may give a good Account of this Matter, by " ſuppoſing them to have been Baptized by *ſprinkling* or *pouring* " *on Water.* For it being the Cuſtom of thoſe Countries to go " bare up to their Knees, only with Sandals upon their Feet, they " might conveniently enough ſtep into their ſhallow Rivers, with- " out laying aſide any part of their Garments to be Baptized, by " having Water *ſprinkled* or *poured upon their Faces.*

But to this Dr *Ruſſel* gives a very witty and compendious Anſwer, he calls it, *all vain, perverſe and malicious Babling.* O rare Demonſtration!

But 'tis farther argu'd by our Adverſaries, that *John* Baptized by *Dipping*; for ſay they, we read, that *John was baptizing in Ænon near Salem, becauſe there was much water there.*

To which I anſwer'd, that the Original Words are, ὕδατα πολλὰ, and ſignifie *many Waters.*

And then I added, that the Truth of this Buſineſs may ſeem to be this; " *John* was *the Voice of one crying in the Wilderneſs*; " and he might have been in many parts of the *Wilderneſs*, where " had he wanted but a Drop of Water, he muſt have travell'd " above ten or twenty Miles before he cou'd have found it; but " he wou'd not continue in any ſuch Place, becauſe of the " Multitudes that daily throng'd to him, to be Baptized of him; " no, but he ſtaid near *Salem*, where there were *many* Springs " or *Waters*, becauſe ſo long as he was thereabouts, he had always " Water at hand to Baptize the People that flockt to him for " that End; for *there were* (ὕδατα πολλὰ) *many Waters there.*

And here Dr *Ruſſel* wou'd fain put on ſome Pleaſantneſs, but cou'd not overcome his inward Vexation; his Ill Nature has ſo unciviliz'd him that he falls foul upon me after ſuch a rude and ſcurrilous manner, as any one above the Breeding of a Water-man wou'd be aſham'd of: And upon the whole Matter, he has given juſt Occaſion to ſuſpect, that he was only hir'd to ſay ſomething againſt me, tho' not at all to the Purpoſe.

This Man, ſays he, *is like the Spies that brought up an Evil Report upon the Good Land; for he repreſents it as a Place exceeding ſcarce of Water, that if a Man had wanted but a Drop of Water, he muſt have travell'd above ten or twenty Miles before he cou'd have found it.*

What

What a falſe, malicious, and plainly mercenary Stroke is here, which can only ſerve to convince us, that Dr *Ruſſel* writ to pleaſe a Party, and was not to mind the *Truth*, ſo much as the *Hire*, for which he was to rail and to revile.

I muſt deſire him to put on his Spectacles, and to read my Words again; and then to ſay whether I brought this Report upon the *Good Land*, or upon the *Wilderneſs*. I hope, Sir, you ſee the Wrong you have done me; and that *You have born Falſe Witneſs againſt your Neighbour.*

But here this Gentleman enters the Liſts with me, and undertakes to prove, that πολὺς *ſignifies not only a Diſcrete, but Continued Quantity*, which is as much as to ſay, that it does ſignifie *many*, tho' not only ſo, but alſo ſometimes *much*.

And then he muſters together ſome places where it is ſo render'd, viz. *much*. And does not he know, (if not, his Knowledge is very ſmall) that far more Places (were it needful) might be inſtanc'd in, where it is render'd *many*.

He does himſelf own, that *Piſcator* tranſlates it *many*.

And had he not minc'd the *Dutch Annotations* upon the Text, * they ſay, that John *Baptized in Ænon, &c. ſeeing there were many Waters there; that is, Brooks or Rivulets.*

* *See* Dr. Ruſſel's *Narrative*, &c. p. 62.

And ſo your own † Mr *Fiſher* renders the words *many Waters*; for, ſays he, *the word is plural.*

† Παιδοβαπτίζοντες πεδίζοντες, p. 333.

As for the reſt of your Human Authorities, rather than trouble my ſelf with enquiring into the Manner of your Repreſenting their Minds and Meaning, which you are uſually very faulty in: I will be content at preſent to confront them with Two very eminent Lights of the Chriſtian Church, *Lactantius* and St *Bernard.*

† *Lactantius*, ſpeaking of our Lord's Baptiſm, calls it, *Purifici Roris Perfuſio, the Perfuſion or Sprinkling of the Purifying Dew.*

† *Lib.* 4. *c.* 15.

And * St *Bernard* ſays expreſly, that *John Baptized our Saviour by pouring Water* upon his Head.

* *Serm. de* St. Joh. *Bapt. p.* 1203.

And with theſe Two Eminent Teſtimonies I conclude my Vindication of my *Third Letter*, and *of the Mode of Baptizing (now generally uſed in the Church of* England*) by Sprinkling, or Pouring on Water.*

A Juſt

A Juſt Vindication of LETTER IV.

I Proceeded in my *Fourth Letter* to the Defence of Infant-Baptiſm, wherein I ſhew'd what we find in Scripture to have been done in the Caſe of Baptizing, by Chriſt and by his Diſciples, in his Life-time.

And all this Dr *Ruſſel* very nimbly leaps over; he was in haſte to charge me with a Miſtake (as he Miſcalls it) in the cloſe of that Letter; where I affirm'd that Infant-Baptiſm was practis'd of old in the *Jewiſh* Church; *For which*, ſays he, *you pretend the Authority of their beſt Writers, without naming one of them.*

But pray, Sir, did I not produce very good Authorities, who had nam'd them to my hands? What are Biſhop *Taylor* and Dr *Towerſon*, No bodies with you now? When they ſeem to favour your Cauſe, you can vouchſafe to give them a good Word perhaps; but when they prove any thing againſt you, you think them then not worth your notice, or your naming.

But is this to your Honour, you great and mighty Sir, to turn your Back ſo ſhamefully of ſuch Great Men; to fall ſo furiouſly upon *a Little Man, a Diminutive Prieſt*, as you diſdainfully term me over and over again?

Oh how bravely and valiantly do you now ſwell and ſwagger, and inſultingly ask me; *Do you know of any Authority for this, beſides the* Jews *lying* Talmud? *If you do, produce it.*

Sweet Sir, As you are ſtout be merciful, and have Patience with me, and I'll be ſo far your humble Servant, as to obey your Command with great Readineſs and Fidelity.

You will not, I think, deny, that the Gentile-Infants were with their Parents proſelyted to the *Jewiſh* Church; but then that ſuch Proſelytes were Baptized, as well as Circumcis'd into that Church, is a Truth that does not merely depend upon the Authority of the *Talmudick* Writers; for I know a much older Authority for it, and will here at your Command *produce it.*

'Tis an illuſtrious Paſſage in *Arrianus* his * *Epictetus*, where the Perſon proſelyted to the *Jewiſh* Religion is ſtyled, βεβαμμένος, *Baptized*; and the Hypocritical Proſelyte is ſtyled, ψευδοβαπτιστὴς, *a Counterfeit Baptized Perſon.*

* *Liber* 2. *c.* 9.

This is taken notice of by your ſometimes Favourite, † Biſhop *Taylor*, *A Proſelyte is called in* Arrianus, ſays he, βεβαμμένος, intinctus, *a Baptized Perſon.*

† *Great Exemplar*, p. 177.

And that very Learned Biſhop tells you farther, that this Cuſtom of Baptizing Proſelytes to the *Jewiſh* Church was ſo notorious, that the very Heathens had learnt to imitate and ape them in it; for, * ſays he, *So they initiated Diſciples into the Secrets of* Mithra; *and the Prieſts of* Cotyttus *were called* Baptæ, *becauſe by* Baptiſm *they were admitted into the Religion.*

* *Id. Ibid.*

To which may be added, from † Dr *Towerſon*, that *He who initiated Men into the Myſteries of* Eleuſis, *was intituled* Ὑδροχόος, *The Waterer.*

† *Of the Sacrament of Baptiſm*, p. 7.

The * Biſhop ſays moreover, that the Doctors of the *Jews* had a Tradition, that *When the* Meſſias *wou'd come, there ſhou'd be ſo many Proſelytes, that they cou'd not be Circumcis'd, but ſhou'd be Baptiz'd.*

* *Ib.* p. 176, 177.

And accordingly, when *John* the Baptiſt enter'd Proſelytes by this Way of Baptiſm, it does not ſeem to have been any new Rite among that People; they never expreſt any wonder at his Baptizing, they never examin'd what he meant by it, or accus'd him for introducing a Novel Ceremony.

Indeed, they queſtion'd his Authority to Baptize; *Why baptizeſt thou then, if thou be not that Chriſt, nor Elias, neither that prophet?* But by this they plainly intimated, that Baptiſm was a thing that they were very well acquainted withal; and that there was an Expectation among them, that when Chriſt or *Elias* ſhou'd come, they might and wou'd Baptize.

D^r *Ruſſel*'s Objection againſt this Antient Cuſtom of the *Jews* to Baptize Infants, which he has taken out of Mr *Delaune*, and from Sr *Norton Knatchbul*, is no more than what was formerly urg'd by Mr *Keach*; and ſufficiently confuted by the Learned Author of *The Religious Conference*, in theſe words:

* " Sr *Norton Knatchbul* does not confute, but confirm the " Cuſtom among the *Jews* of Baptizing Infants; for all that " he ſays is, *That Rabbi* Joſhua *was the firſt* " *that aſſerted it, and Rabbi* Eliezer *contradicted him in it.*

* *Religious Conference*, p. 54, 55.

" But how did he contradict him? He " did not deny the Cuſtom, but wou'd not have ſo much Streſs " laid upon it, as if no one cou'd be a true *Jewiſh* Proſelyte, that " was not Baptiz'd, as well as Circumcis'd.

" The

" The one ſaid, that Baptiſm without Circumciſion made a " true Proſelyte; the other ſaid, that Circumciſion without " Baptiſm made a true Proſelyte.

" But this, inſtead of overthrowing, does confirm the Cuſtom, " that the Baptiſm of Infant-Proſelytes was in uſe among the " *Jews*; ſince this very Thing was the Occaſion of the Diſpute " between them.

But ſay Mr *Keach* and Dr *Ruſſel*, Joſephus *ſays nothing of it.* To which my Author anſwers:

" It may be ſo, what then? As good Hiſtorians (as he) do " mention it, particularly *Maimonides*, who tells us; * *By Three* " *Things* Iſrael *enter'd into Covenant; by* " *Circumciſion, by Baptiſm, and an Offering;* " *and that they Baptized the Infant, or little* " *Stranger, upon the Knowledge and Appoint-* " *ment of the Houſe of Judgment, or the Congregation.*

" In another of their moſt † Authentick Writings 'tis re- " corded, that *When any Heathens became* Jews, *not only the Proſe-* " *lytes themſelves, but alſo their Infant-* " *Children (if they had any) were Baptized.*

" And to counterbalance the Authority of " this Man of our Communion, I ſhall pro- " duce a great Man of their Communion; one of the greateſt " Champions for their bad Cauſe, I mean Mr *Tombes*; who " poſitively affirms, that *Baptiſm was a conſtant concomitant of* " *Circumciſion, if not antienter; and that it was in uſe for many* " *Years together with Circumciſion, tho' not as a Sacrament:* " And for this, he quotes the Learned Mr *Selden*, *Ainſworth* " upon *Geneſis* 17. and Mr *Lightfoot.*

* Tit. Iſſur. Biah, c. 13.

† Gemara Babylonica.

And I muſt obſerve, That Dr *Ruſſel* durſt not heartily rely upon the Authorities which he produc'd againſt this Antient Cuſtom in the *Jewiſh* Church of Baptizing Infants.

And therefore, ſays he, *If they had took up ſuch a Practice, it had been without any Authority from God; it had been only* Jure Humano, *and muſt have been reckon'd amongſt the other parts of their ſuperſtitious and vain Worſhip.*

* Mr *Keach* has worded the ſame Objection thus: That *No Man in his right Wits can think that our Lord Jeſus ſhou'd confirm a vile Tradition and Innovation of the* Jews, *and take his great Ordinance of Baptiſm from the ſuper-* * Relig. Con- *ſtitious, fabulous, and erroneous Cuſtoms of* ſer. p. 54. *their Doctors and Rabbins.*

To which, the Learned Author of the *Conference* hath thus anſwer'd.

† " Why

† " Why might not our Lord Jeſus conſecrate this *Jewiſh*
" Cuſtom into Chriſtian Baptiſm, as well as the *Paſchal Cup*,
" (another *Jewiſh* Cuſtom, and as much
† *Ibid.* " uncommanded as the former) into an
" Eſſential Part of the *Lord's Supper*. The
" one is as rational and warrantable, as the other; and therefore
" a Man may be in his right Wits, that believes both; and
" 'tis rather an Argument of a crackt Brain, not to believe
" either.

* " And again, ſays he, The Truth is, As our Saviour ad-
" opted the *Paſchal Cup* (which was a *Jewiſh* Rite, and an
" Addition to the Paſſover) into an Eſſential
* *Id.* p. 58. " Part of the Lord's Supper: So he con-
" ſecrated the *Jewiſh* Waſhing of their In-
" fants into Chriſtian Baptiſm.

" And then ſays he farther; I may well infer, that ſince
" Chriſt did not except Infants out of his Commiſſion to
" Baptize all Nations, nor his Apoſtles after him forbid it; they
" intended and imply'd thereby, That Infants ſhou'd be Baptized
" in the Chriſtian Church.

The Arguments in my *Plain Letter*, run thus.

" When our Saviour firſt inſtituted his Baptiſm amongſt that
" very People who had then ſuch Antient Cuſtom to Baptize
" Infants; had he made any Exception againſt that their Cuſtom,
" had he excluded ſuch Babes from his Baptiſm, as they ad-
" mitted to theirs, we ſhou'd certainly have heard ſomething
" of it.

" I am ſure, that their Infant-Circumciſion was not laid aſide
" without great Noiſe and Struggle; and therefore that Infant-
" Baptiſm ſhou'd be ſo eaſily quitted, without ſo much as One
" Word ſaid either for or againſt it, is what I profeſs, I cannot
" eaſily believe.

" Nay but I am hereby very much confirm'd in my Belief,
" that Infants were as well admitted to our Lord's Baptiſm,
" when he Baptized in *Judea*; as they then were, and for a long
" time before had been Baptized into the *Jewiſh* Church.

D^r *Ruſſel* objected not againſt this Argument drawn from it, but againſt the Cuſtom it ſelf; and therefore having ſufficiently prov'd the Cuſtom, I have ſaid as much as he has given me Occaſion to ſay, in the *Vindication of my Fourth Letter*.

A Juſt

A Juſt Vindication of LETTER V.

IN my Fifth Letter I was oblig'd to Inquire, what we find in Scripture to have been done in the Caſe of Baptizing by our Lord's Apoſtles, after his Aſcenſion into Heaven.

And here I particularly inſtanc'd in all the Texts of Scripture, wherein we read of their Baptizing, and ſhew'd, by what weak Reaſonings our Adverſaries argue againſt Infants being in the Number of the Perſons Baptized by them.

We read indeed of Three Thouſand Baptized, *Act.* 2. that *they gladly received the word*, &c. and of the *Corinthians* Baptized *Act.* 18. 8. that *they heard, and believ'd*, &c. And ſo we read of ſome others Baptized, that they did what Children cou'd not well be ſuppoſed to do. And hence, our Adverſaries very confidently exclude all Infants out of ſuch Baptized Companies.

To which I anſwer'd, That Children may be in a Company, even when ſome things are ſaid to have been done by the Company, which the Children in it were not capable of doing.

I inſtanc'd in 2 *Chro.* 20. 13, 14. where we are told, that *All Judah ſtood before the Lord, with their little ones and children*, when *Jahaziel* ſaid to them that they ſhou'd do; yea and 'tis alſo ſaid, that they did much greater things than can be affirmed of Children.

But now, tho' that Company is ſaid to have done what Children cou'd not do; yet that very Company conſiſted of Children as well as of Elder People: And to this Dr *Ruſſel* has anſwer'd nothing.

Again, I affirm'd that there will be Children among them *who ſhall appear before the Judgment-Seat of Chriſt*, at the Laſt Day: Tho' it be ſaid of them who ſhall then and there appear, that *They muſt receive for the Good or Evil done in their Bodies*, which are things that Children cou'd not do.

And here (if I may treat the Doctor with his own Language) *He raves and rages, and is at his Wits end.*

Firſt, when the Apoſtle ſays, that *We muſt all appear before the Judgment-Seat of Chriſt*; by *all*, the Doctor will have none to be meant but the Church of *Corinth*, who (if we may take his Word for't) were all Men and Women.

But

But leſt his Word ſhou'd not be taken for that, he recants what he had ſaid, and will have none to be meant by theſe *All* in the Text, but St *Paul himſelf, Silvanus and Timotheus.*

And he will not have the Words to be meant of the General Reſurrection at the Laſt Day, but of the Firſt Reſurrection.

And yet miſtruſting the Weakneſs of all this, he was forc'd at laſt to betake himſelf to his never-failing Artifice of Scolding and Reviling, and to this I will give him no Anſwer.

I argu'd again, That there will be Infants in the Bleſſed Number *at the right Hand of the Judge, at the Laſt Day*; when the Judge ſhall ſay to them, *I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat*, &c. which Infants cannot be ſaid to have done.

And this the Doctor calls, *A confuſed Piece of Nonſenſe, a bold and daring Impertinence, utter'd by an ignorant Man*, &c.

And what hurts the Doctor now? Why truly he will make us to know, that he is a *Chiliaſt*; and that theſe Words of St *Matthew* are not ſpoken of the General Judgment. And here, *He beſtirs himſelf, and lays about him*, to prove my Ignorance in applying theſe Words to the *Laſt Day.*

But by your Leave, Sir; I have lookt into the Contents of that Chapter, ſet before it in my Bible, and there I am told, that from Verſe 31, to the end, we have *A Deſcription of the Laſt Judgment.* And this I will believe, tho' you cou'd talk to the contrary till that *Doomſday* it ſelf.

And thus, there might be Infants among the Three Thouſand Baptized, and among the Baptized *Corinthians*, &c. Tho' it be ſaid of them, that *They heard and believ'd, and continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine*, &c. As well as there will be Infants among theſe at the *Right Hand of the Judge* at the Laſt Day, when the Judge ſhall ſay to them, *I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat*, &c.

But 'tis more particularly objected, That there were no Infants among the *Samaritans* Baptiz'd, *Act.* 8. 12. becauſe tis ſaid, that *they were baptized, both men and women.*

To which I anſwer'd from Mr *Horn*, That Children, together with the Elder ſort, are expreſt in Scripture by *Men and Women*; as may be ſeen, *Joſhua* 8. 25, 26. *Judges* 9. 49, 51.

And here, after this *Trifling Doctor* had plaid the *Merry Andrew*, and had made himſelf ridiculous to make his Party merry with Mr *Horn*'s Name; he looks into *Joſhua* 8. 25, 26. where he finds the Words to be theſe.

And ſo it was, that all that fell that day, both of men and women, were twelve thouſand, even all the men of Ai; for Joſhua drew not his hand back, wherewith he ſtretched out the ſpear, until he had deſtroy'd all the inhabitants of Ai. And

And Dr *Ruſſel* will not have the Children to be meant by that *Men and Women*, but by *all the Inhabitants of* Ai.

But Sir, Even *all the Inhabitants of* Ai were but *Twelve Thouſand*, and *the Men and Women* were ſaid to be *Twelve Thouſand*. So that by the *Men and Women*, muſt be meant even *all the Twelve Thouſand Inhabitants of* Ai, who were Men, Women, and Children, as you have your ſelf prov'd.

And the ſame Obſervation will likewiſe anſwer what you have objected againſt *Judges* 9. 49, 51.

I farther obſerv'd concerning the *Houſholds* that we find to have been Baptiz'd by the Apoſtles, as the *Houſholds* of *Cornelius*, *Lydia*, the *Jayler*, *Criſpus*, and *Stephanas*, that there is not the leaſt Exception as to *Infants*. Nor can I believe them to have been all barren and childleſs Families, becauſe there's not the leaſt Syllable or Circumſtance denoting any ſuch thing.

And particularly, when it is ſaid, That there were no Children in the Houſhold of *Stephanas* Baptized by St *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. becauſe no Children are mention'd.

I anſwer'd, " That I may as well ſay, that here was no Faith, " no Repentance, nor any ſuch thing as ſome contend for to " qualifie for Baptiſm; becauſe there is no mention made of any " ſuch thing.

But to confute this, the Doctor flies to his *Billingſgate*-Arguments again; he ſays, *'Tis ridiculous, and that I am profoundly ignorant, and might be aſham'd on't*, &c.

And Why? Becauſe the Apoſtle tells us of the Houſe of *Stephanas*, that *They had addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints*; which implies Faith and Repentance. 1 *Cor.* 16. 15.

And 'tis true, *They had addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints*, when St *Paul* writ this Epiſtle: But to argue from hence, that they had *ſo addicted themſelves* when they were Baptized, is ſuch a ſhameful Blunder in Chronology, that *He muſt be profoundly ignorant indeed, that is not aſham'd of it.*

Dr *Ruſſel* tells us in his * Book, That *He was qualify'd for a Preacher, according to the late Act of Parliament, for the Eaſe of Proteſtant-Diſſenters.* But does it from hence follow, that he was ſo qualify'd when he was † Baptized, which was many Years before that Act of Parliament was made

* Pag. 45.

† *See his Book*, pag. 111.

In like manner, becauſe St *Paul* tells us of the Houſe of *Stephanas*, that *They had addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints*, when he writ his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*: does it thence follow, That they had ſo addicted themſelves when they

they were Baptized, which was ſeveral Years before that Epiſtle was written?

And *can Dr.* Ruſſel *perſuade his People to ſwallow* ſuch a groſs Blunder as this, *without Chewing the Cud upon't*, as he floridly ſpeaks.

I may here add, That he cannot ſhew me that the Apoſtles Baptized any Perſons, whom we read to have had Families; but I can alſo ſhew him, That together with theſe Perſons, their Families were Baptized likewiſe.

For thus, when *Cornelius* was Baptized, ſo were *All that were in the Houſe with him*, Act. 10. 47, 48. when *Lydia* was Baptized, ſo was *her Houſhold*, Act. 16. 15. and when *the Jayler* was Baptized, ſo were *all his*, Act. 16. 33. and when *Criſpus* was Baptized, ſo was *all his Houſe*, Act. 18. 8. and when *Stephanas* was Baptized, ſo was *his Houſhold*, 1 Cor. 1. 16.

And when they were thus Baptized into the Church by *Families*, it was exactly according to that Antient Prophecy concerning Chriſt, That *In Him* (who was the Seed of *Abraham*) *all the Families of the Earth ſhou'd be bleſſed.* Gen. 12. 3.

And now ſuppoſe, that the King of *England* ſhou'd command Twelve Biſhops accuſtom'd to Infant-Baptiſm, ſaying, *Go ye, Diſciple all the Heathen Nations in* America; *Baptizing them, and Teaching them the Chriſtian Religion.*

And farther, Suppoſing that after the Arrival of theſe Right Reverend Fathers among thoſe Infidels, we ſhou'd receive from them this certain Intelligence, That they had begun their Great Work ſucceſsfully, and had Baptized many particular Perſons, and alſo *Five whole Families*; (not an Infant excepted in any of them:) Shou'd we not from hence very rationally conclude, That they Baptized Infants?

And yet this is the Caſe, The Apoſtles who had been *Jews*, amongſt whom (as I before ſhew'd) Infant-Baptiſm was an undoubted Cuſtom, they were ſent upon this Errand, to *Diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them.* And not long after, we have this certain Intelligence, That they began their Great Work ſucceſsfully; and that they Baptized many particular Perſons, and alſo *Five whole Families*, (not an Infant excepted in any of them.) And may we not from hence very rationally conclude, That they Baptized Infants.

Indeed, conſidering how little we read in Scripture of their Baptizing, in compariſon of what they really did in this Caſe, this is as good Proof of their Baptizing Infants, as can well be expected.

I am

I am ſure Dr *Ruſſel* has no ſuch Proof that they Baptized either Men or Women who were born of Chriſtian Parents; and therefore we have much better Proof that they Baptized Infants, than he has that they ever Baptized any ſuch Perſons, as he pretends to Baptize.

And upon this account the *Quakers* object againſt Dr *Ruſſel*'s Practice of Baptizing thoſe whoſe Parents are Chriſtians: For, ſay they, the Apoſtles never Baptized any ſuch; the Apoſtles never Baptized any but ſuch as were born either of *Jewiſh*, or *Gentile* Parents.

I will indeed own, that this is but a poor Objection of the *Quakers*; but yet 'tis altogether as good as Dr *Ruſſel*'s Objection againſt Infant-Baptiſm from the Practice of the Apoſtles.

But now, ſeeing that the Scripture is ſo very ſilent in this Caſe of their Baptizing, that we read not a Word of above two thirds of the Apoſtles; not a Syllable of their Baptizing either Man, Woman, or Child: I from hence obſerv'd, That we muſt be oblig'd to the Writers of the following Ages, if we wou'd know what was really done by theſe Apoſtles in the Diſcharge of their Commiſſion to Baptize all Nations.

And here, ſays Dr *Ruſſel*, *I thought to have found ſome Hiſtories mention'd by this Gentleman, to have prov'd Infant-Baptiſm an Apoſtolical Practice: But in this he is altogether deficient, and hath not aſſigned one Inſtance in Hiſtory to prove this bold Aſſertion.*

And yet I had ſhewn, That Infant-Baptiſm was ackowledged by *Menno*, one of the moſt Learned of the *Anabaptiſts*, to be as old as the Times of the Apoſtles.

And that the Chriſtian Church Baptized Infants in the firſt Ages thereof, I ſaid was prov'd by Dr *Falkner* from St *Auguſtine*, St *Cyprian*, *Origen*, and the Famous *African Council*.

And the Univerſal Reception of Infant-Baptiſm in the Catholick Church, is ſo clearly and ſufficiently evidenc'd by the Hiſtorical *Theſes* of *Voſſius*, that I refer'd him thither, who wou'd ſee more large and ample Proof thereof.

Indeed Dr *Ruſſel* wou'd have it believ'd, That we have no better Evidence for it, than is produc'd out of *Juſtin's Reſponſes*, and ſome other *Spurious Pieces*.

And then, tho' he had ſaid juſt before, That *I had not aſſign'd one Inſtance from Hiſtory*; yet he now deſires me, *Not to trouble him any more with my pretended Lying corrupt Hiſtorians.*

The truth is, he gave himſelf the trouble, of *Blotting innocent Paper* (as he ſpeaks) *without Provocation*. For thoſe very Spurious Pieces which he falls upon, are acknowledg'd by himſelf to be rejected by the Learned *Voſſius*, who was the Hiſtorian that I refer'd to.

But, says he, *I shall confront this bold diminutive Parish-Priest, with a great and learned Bishop of the Church of* England, *the late Dr.* Barlow, *Bishop of* Lincoln, *in his Letter to Mr.* Tombes; *whose words are these.*

I do believe and know, that there is neither Precept nor Example in Scripture for Pædobaptism; nor any just Evidence for it; for above 200 Years after Christ, that Tertullian *condemns it as an unwarrantable Custom, and* Nazianzen *a good while after him, dislikes it too,* &c.

Great Sir, be not angry, but suffer me to ask, what you mean by a *Diminutive Priest*? Pray what New Degrees of Comparison have you found out in the Sacred Order of *Priesthood*? Oh Sir, for Shame, if you must be Railing, Rail in Sense, or else for ever hereafter hold your Peace.

Let me ask again, Was Dr *Barlow* a great and learned Bishop of the Church of *England* when he writ that Letter? No, Sir, no; he *knew* better things, and had far more *Learning*, before he was so highly advanc'd: Yea and I will confront the Letter, with what I believe he did himself subscribe to before he was made Bishop; and sure I am, that afterwards he Ordain'd neither Priest nor Deacon that did not: *viz.* That

* *Article* 27. * *The Baptism of young Children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable to the Institution of Christ.*

But because I have seen this Letter cited at least a dozen times in our Adversaries Books, and because Dr *Russel* lays great Stress upon it, and has adorn'd his *Title-Page*, as well as confronted me with it in this place; I will here take the liberty to examine it so far, as it seems to contradict what I am now to prove.

As for the Dislike which *Nazianzen* is said to have shewn to Infant-Baptism, it makes nothing for Dr *Russel*'s Practice. *Nazianzen* does indeed in his † Oration concerning Baptism, advise, That the Baptism of Children shou'd be defer'd till they were about three Years old; but yet in the same place he declares the Lawfulness of Baptizing Infants (as they were Circumcis'd) the Eighth Day. Nay and he urges the great Advantages that those Infants receive by their Baptism, who dye in their Infancy; yea and he strenuously presseth their Baptism when they are in danger of Death; and wou'd by no means have them dye Unbaptized.

† *Orat.* 40. *p.* 458.

‖ *Ibid. p.* 448.

And in another place, in the same * Oration, he persuades the Baptizing of Children, and

* wou'd

wou'd have them to be *ſo Sanctify'd* (ἐν βρέφει) *from their Infancy.*

And now let any Man judge of the *Diſlike* which *Nazianzen* ſhew'd to Infant-Baptiſm.

But the chief thing that I am obliged to take notice of in the aforeſaid Letter, is this, That *There is no juſt Evidence for Infant-Baptiſm, for above 200 Years after Chriſt; and that* Tertullian *condemns it, as an unwarrantable Cuſtom.*

And is not this a Contradiction? Was it become a *Cuſtom* in *Tertullian*'s time, and yet have we *No Evidence for it, for above 200 Years after Chriſt?* Pray, Sir, Did not *Tertullian* flouriſh within leſs than 200 *Years* after the *Death* of Chriſt? Yes, he did; and yet 'tis confeſt in the Letter, That Infant-Baptiſm was become a Cuſtom in *Tertullian*'s time: Which is a *juſt Evidence*, that it had been ſo long practis'd, that it was grown even into a *Cuſtom within* 200 *Years after Chriſt.*

And again, It is not true, that *Tertullian* Condemns Infant-Baptiſm as an unwarrantable Cuſtom; he does indeed adviſe, That their Baptiſm ſhou'd be delay'd, till they ſhou'd be inſtructed.

But *Famelius* is of Opinion, That he there ſpeaks of the Baptiſm of ſuch Infants whoſe Parents were Infidels.

And that he had ſome ſpecial Caſe in his Eye, is plain from this; That in the ſame place he alſo adviſes, that *Widows* and *Virgins* ſhou'd delay their Baptiſm.

And to confirm the Opinion of *Famelius*, it may be obſerv'd, That * *Tertullian* intimates plainly enough in another place, that the *Infants of Chriſtian Parents* are fitly qualify'd for Baptiſm; yea and aſſerts, That Baptiſm is generally neceſſary to Salvation; which he proves from thoſe words of Chriſt, (Niſi Quis,) *Except One be Born again*, &c.

* *Tertul. de Animâ*, c. 39.

And can *a Man of Learning* from hence conclude, That Tertullian *condemns Infant-Baptiſm, as an unwarrantable Cuſtom?*

I will proceed to prove, That we have ſtill farther Evidence for Infant-Baptiſm, within leſs than 200 *Years after Chriſt.*

And I will here note, That they who write againſt Infant-Baptiſm, do uſually charge it with being the Occaſion of that Human Invention (as they call it) of God-Fathers and God-Mothers.

[a] *Infant-Sprinkling* (ſays Dr *Ruſſel*'s Friend C. D.) *introduced many deceitful and crafty Inventions of Antichriſt, as Goſſips*, &c.

[a] The Reaſon, &c. p. 66.

[b] Mr *Dan-*

[b] Mr *Danvers* reckons *Gossips or Sureties among the Human Inventions introduc'd by Infant-Baptism.*

[b] Treatise of Bapt. *part* 2. *cap.* 5. *p.* 211.

[c] And the Learned Mr *Tombes* himself says, That *Infant-Baptism occasion'd that Human Invention of Witnesses in Baptism.*

But now if *Gossips*, or *Sureties*, or *Witnesses* in Baptism were occasion'd by *Infant-Baptism*; then it follows undeniably, That *Infant-Baptism* was in use in the Christian Church, before there was any such thing as *Gossips*, or *Sureties*, or *Witnesses* in Baptism heard of.

[c] *See his* Exercitation, *as quoted by Mr.* Marshal, *p.* 253.

And yet nothing can be plainer, than, That such Witnesses are as antient as the time of [d] *Hyginus* Bishop of *Rome*; which was within 140 Years after Christ.

[d] *See* Platina in vitâ Hygini.

And this is a just Evidence, That Infant-Baptism (yea and according to *C. D.* Infant-Sprinkling) was before this still: For it was the Occasion of these *Witnesses*, and was therefore before them, as our Adversaries must needs acknowledge; and therefore within less than 140 Years after Christ; and consequently within less than 40 Years after the Death of the Apostle St *John.*

And for a farther Proof of this Antiquity of Infant-Baptism, I appeal to *Irenæus*, who speaks expresly of, and pleads for *Infants*, *Little-ones*, and *Children's* being *regenerated* or *born again*; that is to say, *Baptized*: For *Regeneration* is a word vere frequently used for *Baptism* in the Primitive Writings; being the word used for *Baptism* by St *Paul* himself, *Titus* 3. 5.

And now I will observe what * St *Basil* says of *Irenæus*; viz. That *He was one near to the Apostles*; or as St *Hierom* expresses it, *He was a Man of the Apostolick times.*

* *Cave's* Apostol. *p.* 162.

To which I will add the Evidence of *Justin Martyr* in his *First Apology*, (for so I call that which is usually set last; for, says D[r] † *Cave*, tho' in all Editions it be set in the second place, it was unquestionably the first) where speaking of the Excellency of the Christian Law above all other Human Laws, for setting Bounds to the Carnal Desires of Men, he not only speaks of many Persons *Converted and changed from their Intemperance*, when Men: But, says he, *There are many Men and Women of* 60 *and* 70 *Years of Age, who having* from their Childhood *been* Discipled *unto Christ, have all their time continued uncorrupt.*

† Apostol. *p.* 145.

But now this is certain, that young Children cannot otherwiſe be Diſcipl'd unto Chriſt but by Baptiſm; and therefore they who were *Diſcipl'd unto Chriſt from their Childhood*, were undoubtedly Baptized; as * *Towerſon* of D^r * *Towerſon* from this very Paſſage, has undeniably prov'd. Bapt. *p.* 335, 336.

And indeed, to be made *Diſciples* unto Chriſt, is to be made his *Scholars*, as D^r *Ruſſel* ſays; and to be made his *Scholars*, is to be admitted into his *School*, which is his Church: And D^r *Ruſſel* alſo acknowledges, that there is no other Way of being admitted into his Church, but by Baptiſm. So that to be admitted into Chriſt's *School*, and ſo *Diſcipl'd* or made *Scholars*, is but in other terms, to be *Baptized* into his *Church*.

And now if D^r *Ruſſel* will be pleaſed to look into Dr *Cave's Chronological Table* at the End of his *Apoſtolici*, he will find that *Juſtin Martyr* writ this *Apology* in the Year of Chriſt 140.

And in the ſame *Table* he may obſerve, That St *John* dyed but juſt 40 Years, and writ his *Goſpel* but 43 Years, and his *Revelations* but 46 Years, before that *Apology* of *Juſtin Martyr* was written.

And from hence it follows, That the *Many Men and Women, who had been Diſcipl'd unto Chriſt*, (that is, Baptized into his Church) *from their Childhood, and were 60 or 70 Years of Age*, when *Juſtin* writ his *Apology*: It from hence follows, I ſay, That theſe *Many Men and Women had been Baptized in their Childhood*, ſome of them *twenty*, and ſome of them *thirty Years* before St *John* dyed; and all of them *ſeveral Years* before the Book of *Revelations*, or *the Goſpel according to St.* John was written.

And ſhou'd any here ſay (as that Learned *Anabaptiſt* Menno did) that tho' Infant-Baptiſm was as old as the Times of the *Apoſtles*, yet it was then practis'd by falſe Apoſtles, and falſe Teachers; I thus briefly anſwer, (and for a full Anſwer to this, I refer'd to *The Caſe of Infant-Baptiſm*, p. 47, *&c.*)

How came it to paſs, that St *John* did not oppoſe it as a dangerous and unlawful Practice? In his Books of *Revelations*, he complain'd of, and reprov'd many Errours in the Chriſtian Churches; and why then did he not there complain of, and reprove this too?

And in his *Goſpel* he obviates the early *Hereſies* of thoſe Times, eſpecially of *Ebion* and *Cerinthus*; but, Why does he not alſo caution againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*, if it was and Innovation, and practis'd only by Falſe Teachers?

And

And as St *John* says nothing against it, so neither do any of the Saints or Martyrs who lived at that time; St *Clemens*, as also St *Ignatius* and St *Polycarp*, who were St *John's Scholars*, none of them make any Complaint of any such thing.

But certainly had Infant-Baptism been an Innovation, or contrary to the Practice of the true Apostles, some or other of the Apostolick Fathers wou'd have oppos'd it, and wou'd not have suffer'd it so quietly to over-run the Christian Church, and to unchurch it.

The Fathers of these Primitive Ages were watchful enough against all other Errours, that then arose in the Church, and very zealously oppos'd them: And cou'd such a pestilent Abuse of the Holy Ordinance of Baptism (as Dr *Russel* makes *Infant-Baptism* to be) be then so tamely submitted to, as never to be once complain'd of, or caution'd against? Certainly no.

And here I will challenge Dr *Russel* to produce any Authentick Author in those first and best Times, or even in the time of *Hyginus*, when *God-Fathers* and *God-Mothers* were occasion'd (as Mr *Tombes* and others say) by *Infant-Baptism*; or even in *Tertullian's* time, when *Infant-Baptism* is acknowledg'd to have grown into a *Custom*: I challenge him, I say, to produce any Authentick Writers of these Ages, that ever complain of *Infant-Baptism* as an Upstart-Practice, or as an Unlawful Abuse of Baptism; or that ever condemn'd it (as he does) to be no Baptism; or that ever requir'd, that they who were Baptized in their Infancy, shou'd be Baptized again when they came to Riper Years; or that ever made a Schism, and separated from the Church upon the Account of her Baptizing Children.

But now seeing that none of these Primitive *Saints* or *Martyrs* did at any Time, or upon any Occasion, thus accuse *Infant-Baptism*; or either complain of it as an Innovation, or condemn it as an Unlawful Custom: 'Tis an undoubted Argument that they knew it to be otherwise, and that it was practis'd by the Apostles themselves, with whom some of these Primitive *Saints* had personally convers'd.

So great reason had * *Origen* to say, that *The Church did receive from the Apostles a Tradition, to give Baptism to Little-ones.*

* Lib. 5. ad Rom. c. 6.

And to you (my Brethren of the Church of *England*) I will conclude this Point in the words of † St *Augustine*, Nemo vobis, *&c.* *Let no Man whisper to you any other Doctrine,* Infant-Baptism *is what the Church hath always held; this from the Faith of her Ancestors she did receive, and this she keeps perseveringly unto the end.*

† Serm. 10. de verbis Apost.

A Just

A Juſt Vindication of LETTER VI.

MY Buſineſs in this Letter was, "To enquire from "Scripture, Whether *Infant-Baptiſm* was taught by "our Saviour in his Life-time.

"And here I obſerv'd, That whatever may be proved from "Scripture by right and genuine Conſequence, is *taught* in "Scripture.

For ſo was the Reſurrection *taught* in the Books of *Moſes*, and proved there-from by our Lord himſelf, againſt the *Sadducees*.

"*Have ye not read*, ſaid our Lord, *in the books of Moſes, how* "*God ſpake unto him, ſaying, I am the God of Abraham, the God* "*of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob:* To which he added, *But God* "*is not the God of the dead, but of the living.*

"And this was our Saviour's *Scripture-Proof* of a Reſurrection; "and from theſe very Words, by juſt Reaſonings and Conſe- "quences, did he make the Truth of that great Doctrine appear "to thoſe very *Sadducees* themſelves, who had ſo long, and ſo "ſtiffly oppos'd it.

But now, Tho' our Lord himſelf did thus very ſucceſsfully diſpute with, and convince the *Sadducees*; yet Dr *Ruſſel* will have us to to know, That had he been to diſpute with theſe *Sadducees*, he wou'd have prov'd a Reſurrection after an other guiſe manner than our Saviour did: And, as if he wou'd be thought able to outdo our Saviour in the Diſputation, he produces ſeveral Teſtimonies out of the Books of the Prophets, and all to no other purpoſe than to diſcover his own Vanity, and his own Ignorance.

And I muſt here preſume *to acquaint him for his better Inſtruction*, That had he made uſe of theſe Teſtimonies out of the Prophets againſt the *Sadducees*, *they wou'd have laught him to ſcorn*, (as his own Expreſſions are.)

For, the *Sadducees* own'd no other Scripture but the *Five Books of* Moſes; or at leaſt, * *They eſteemed nothing as a neceſſary Article of Faith, which had not ſome Foundation in theſe Books.*

And therefore it wou'd have been in vain to prove an Article of Faith to them out of any other; which was the Reaſon why our Saviour choſe to confute them with a *Conſequential Proof* but of *Moſes*, rather than

* Tillotſon's *Serm.* Vol. III. p. 164.

than by any other Proof out of any other part of the *Old Testament*; and all that Dr *Russel* has added, wou'd not have convinc'd them so readily, as this one Proof did. So that upon this Occasion he might have spared his unprofitable, and altogether needless Pains.

I farther took notice, That as our Saviour proved a Resurrection by just Consequence from Scripture against the *Sadducees*; so likewise have the Learned Defenders of our Faith prov'd by many undoubted Consequences from Scripture the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghost*, against the *Macedonians*.

And here (as at all times) the Doctor is very liberal of his hard Words: He charges me, *With giving too great Countenance to the* Socinian *Heresie, with calling in question the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and with sinning against the Holy Spirit*, &c.

And yet I positively affirm'd, and prov'd it too, That there are in Scripture such things said of the *Holy Ghost*, as by undoubted Consequence prove him to be God.

But 'tis true, I observ'd, That it is not expressly asserted *in Terminis*, that *the Holy Ghost is God*.

And here, after the Doctor by his *Legerdemain*-Tricks, *and cunning Craftiness, whereby he lies in wait to deceive*, had made my words *in Terminis* vanish into an *&c.* he shews, from *Act.* 5: 3, 4. that the Holy Ghost is called God.

But Sir, Are these very *Terms*, *The Holy Ghost is God*, in that Text, or is it any more than one of the *undoubted Consequences* that I spoke of, by which the Holy Ghost is proved to be God. The Learned * *Whitaker* will defend me against all the heavy things which you have here unjustly laid to my Charge. He intimates indeed, That in Scripture it is as plain, that the Holy Ghost is God, as that two and two make four, or as that five and five make ten. Yet says he, *Non dicitur expressè, & totidem verbis, Spiritum Sanctum esse Deum.* Which in another Language are the very Words for which you have so severely judg'd and condemn'd me.

* *Disputa. de Sacrâ Scripturâ*, p. 386.

And † says Dr *Burnet*, (now Bishop of *Sarum*) whom Dr *Russel* is sometimes pleased to complement) *There were very few Hereticks that had Face and Brow enough to set up against expreß Words of Scripture.*

† *See his Discourse, to shew how unreasonable it is to ask for expreß Words of Scripture*, &c. *annext to* A Relation of a Conference, *&c.*

And therefore he proves, that it was not only our Saviour's way of arguing against the *Sadducees* by *Consequence*, but he shews in several Instances, that the Apostles also made great use

uſe of Deductions, and did prove by Conſequences drawn from Scripture, the greateſt, and moſt important Articles of Faith.

Yea, ſays he, "We find that it was the Method of the Church "of God in all Ages, to found her Deciſions of the moſt im- "portant Controverſies on Conſequences from Scripture; and if "we examine the Method of Councils in condemning Hereticks, "and of the Fathers in writing againſt them, we ſhall always find "them proceeding upon Deductions and Conſequences drawn "from Scripture, as a ſufficient Ground to go upon.

And then he proceeds to ſhew, How ſeveral Hereticks were thus diſputed againſt by the Fathers; and particularly, that the *Macedonians* were *thus* argu'd withal.

And now, (as Dr *Ruſſel* ſpeaks) *Whilſt I have ſo great a Man to juſtifie me* in my Account of the *Macedonian* Controverſie; *I ſhall not value what ſuch a Man as Dr.* Ruſſel *ſaith in Contradiction thereto.*

* I will add, That as the *Socinians* deny the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt in ſpight of Conſequences, even ſo upon the ſame Grounds and Principles they deny Infant-Baptiſm likewiſe.

* *See Mr.* Edwards's *Socinian Creed*, p. 170, 171.

And it can only amuſe the Ignorant, to hear Dr *Ruſſel* ſo frequently calling out for expreſs Scripture for Infant-Baptiſm; for this was a Trick of all the antient Hereticks, who defended their ſeveral Hereſies by the like loud Cry for Expreſs Scripture: For *Few of them had Face or Brow enough to ſet up againſt Expreſs Scripture*, as Dr *Burnet* ſaid: And therefore, if we ſuppoſe that Dr *Ruſſel* has not, yet herein what is he better than they?

But before I paſs this, I will tell Dr *Ruſſel* ſomething which perhaps he may take notice of; I mean, That his greateſt Friend Bp *Taylor*, amongſt other thing of the like nature tells us, That *Infant-Baptiſm*, and *That the Holy Ghoſt is God*, are alike proved from Scripture. *Duct. Dubit.* p. 370.

And afterwards, treating particularly of theſe, he ſays, "*That* "*the Holy Ghoſt is God*, is no where ſaid in Scripture, it follows "not therefore, that he is not God; and the reaſon is, becauſe "that *He is God*, is *a certain Conſequent* from ſomething that is "expreſly affirm'd. *Ibid.* p. 382.

And again, ſpeaking of *Infant-Baptiſm*, he ſays, if it be argu'd thus, "We do not find in Scripture, nor in the Days of the Apoſtles any Infants Baptized; therefore we conclude there was none.

He anſwers, "This is μέσον μειχὸν, (he means a Partial *Medium*, and therefore no good Argument:) "It is true, ſays "he, if there was no other way to find it, (Infant-Baptiſm) this "Negative Argument wou'd be a good one (meaning, as to the "Logick of it) But we derive it, &c.

" We derive it from the *the force of Christ's Words in the Insti-*
" *tution*, and *of his Discourse with* Nicodemus, and *the Analogy of*
" *Circumcision*, and *the Practice of the* Jews *in Baptizing their Chil-*
" *dren*, and *many Proprieties of Scripture*, and *the Effect of the*
" *Sacrament*, and *the Necessity of Regeneration.* Ibid. p. 385. Thus that great Man.

Upon the whole Matter, If we can prove Infant-Baptism by just Consequences drawn from Scripture, we have as good Proof for it, as our Saviour made use of against the *Sadducees*; and as the Apostles and Primitive Fathers made use of against the most and greatest Heresies of their Times: And he must be very unreasonable, and too much a Friend to Hereticks, who will not allow this to be Proof sufficient.

And it was to this End, that I instanc'd in our Saviour's Disputation with the *Sadducees*, and in the *Macedonian* Controversie: *viz.* To make it appear, that a just and genuine Consequence drawn from Scripture, is good *Scripture-Proof.*

And here I undertook to prove, That our Blessed Lord and Saviour did in his Life-time teach, That Children are to be admitted into his Church; and *consequently*, That they are to be admitted by Baptism. But,

I first observ'd, That Infants were admitted into God's Church of Old; and That the Christian Church, is but that Old Church Reform'd: So that Infants are still to be admitted into it, unless it be a part of the Reformation to exclude them.

Dr *Russel* is very angry with me, and bestows still more and more ill Words upon me, for saying, That the Christian Church is the Old Church Reform'd; and charges me with saying so, not only *without*, but *contrary* to Scripture-Testimonies.

But, Sir, your affirming that I said so *without* Scripture Testistimonies, is to abuse and blind your Readers; and a plain Argument, That my Scripture-Testimonies were such, as you durst not acquaint your Readers withal.

'Tis indeed undeniable from that Scripture which I alledg'd, That the Christians were *grafted* into the *same standing Olive-Tree* (to which the Church of God before the Coming of Christ is resembled) from which the *Jews* were broken off. *Rom.* 11. 16, 17, 18.

And I shew'd in the Words of a very Learned Author, That Christianity *is* Judaism *explain'd into its Spiritual Sense and Meaning.* And hence it is, that the *Christians* in the *New Testament* are called *Jews*, that is, *Reformed* Jews, *Revel.* 2. 9. and sometimes, *The Israel of God*, Galat. 6. 16. and sometimes, *The Children of* Abraham, *Gal.* 3. 7. And hence it is, that *The Christian Church* is

called

called *The New* Jeruſalem, becauſe it is the *Old* Jeruſalem (or Jewiſh *Church*) *renew'd* and enlarg'd.

To which I will add, That *Chriſtians* are ſaid to be *Proſelyted to mount* Sion, as the Old Church is call'd. *Heb.* 12. 22. προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει.

But here *Dr.* Ruſſel *delivers his Sentiments in the Words of Sir* Charles Wolſley, *and is very poſitive, That the Goſpel did abrogate the whole Law; and that nothing of the Law is now in force, but what is anew commanded in the Goſpel:* And then he *heartily wiſhes, that I had attain'd to the ſame meaſure of Knowledge in theſe Things.*

I have no cauſe to thank him for his *Hearty Ill Wiſh*, which none but an *Antinomian* or an *Anabaptiſt* will ſay *Amen* to; and I will here profeſs, that I do not: For I am perſuaded, That the Moral Law as deliver'd in the Decalogue, is ſtill in force, and needs not the Authority of any new Injunction to make it ſo, it being indeed the Law which our Saviour himſelf has declar'd, that *He came not to deſtroy.*

Indeed, when the Goſpel firſt appeared in the World, it was *by Heathens* objected againſt, as teaching a *Novel Religion*, as being a *New Law.*

To which it was anſwer'd, That the *Chriſtian Religion* was *for Subſtance* the ſame with that of the antient *Jews*, and that the *Jews* of old were ſaved as the *Chriſtians* are now, thro' the ſame *Chriſt*; who is therefore ſaid to be, *The Lamb ſlain from the Foundation of the World.* Revel. 13. 8.

* The antient *Patriarchs*, ſays *Euſebius*, were the *Chriſtians* of the *Old World*, who had the ſame Faith, Religion, and Worſhip, common with us.

And ſays † *Gregory the Great*, *Saints before the Law, Saints under the Law. Saints under the Goſpel, all theſe make up the Body of Chriſt, and are reckon'd among the Members of the Church.*

'Tis true indeed, at the Reformation made in the Church by Chriſt Jeſus, almoſt the whole was every way alter'd for the better; and Dr *Ruſſel* inſtances in ſome of theſe Alterations, and from thence wou'd infer, That that whole Church (Root and Branch) was aboliſh'd.

* *See Dr.* Cave's *Prim. Chriſt.* p. 22.

† Sancti ante Legem, Sancti ſub Lege, Sancti ſub Gratiâ; omnes hi perficientes Corpus Domini, in Membris ſunt Eccleſiæ conſtituti. *Greg. Mag.* Epiſt. 24.

But if this be not expreſly *againſt Scripture-Teſtimony*, nothing is; for nothing can be plainer, than that *The Root of the Olive-Tree which bore the* Jewiſh *Branches before they were broken off,*

is the ſame Root which bears the Chriſtian *Branches now.* Rom. 11. 18.

And here, if it be enquir'd, for what theſe Branches were broken off from that Olive-Tree, (the Church) I anſwer, That they were not broken off becauſe of the Reformation, or any Alterations made in that Church excluding them; but *becauſe of their own Unbelief*; for ſo the Apoſtle expreſly tells us, *Rom.* 11. 20.

And now, ſeeing none were broken off, or unchurch'd, but *Becauſe of their own Unbelief*; it follows, That *Children* were not *Unchurch'd*, as Dr *Ruſſel* ſays they were: Unleſs he will ſay, that they were guilty of *Unbelief*, which I hope he will not; or if he does, I hope none will *believe* him.

In ſhort, If *Children* are not *Unchurch'd* becauſe of *Unbelief*, then they are to be admitted *Church-Members* ſtill, as God of old *commanded* them to be, unleſs our Lord did afterwards *forbid* them.

Dr *Ruſſel* ſays indeed, That *All the Trumperies in the* Romiſh *Worſhip may be juſtify'd upon this rotten corrupt Notion*, viz. *That they are not forbidden.*

To which I anſwer, That *His Inſtance is impertinent*; for the *Romiſh* Trumpery was never *commanded* by God, as Infant's Church-Membership was.

So that tho' our Reformers juſtly threw out of the Church all the *Romiſh* Trumperies, without ſhewing where they were *forbidden*, becauſe they were never *commanded*; yet this will not juſtifie Dr *Ruſſel*'s ſhutting Children out of the Church, whoſe Admiſſion into't was once *commanded* by God; unleſs he can ſhew where it is again *forbidden.*

And therefore, without asking his Leave, I will again ſay; 'Tis very plain, that unleſs our Lord has *forbidden* Infants to be admitted into his Church, they are ſtill to be admitted, whether he has *commanded* their Admiſſion, or no.

And if they are to be admitted, Dr *Ruſſel* acknowledges that they are to be Baptized; for he grants (it being indeed undeniable) that there is no other Way of Admiſſion into the Church, but by Baptiſm.

And having thus far clear'd the Way, (which I hope was not *a forgetting my ſelf*, as the Doctor poorly inſinuates) I then proceeded to ſhew, That our Lord was ſo far from *forbidding* the *Admiſſion* of Infants into his *Church*, that he has expreſly *commanded* it in that celebrated Text, *Suffer little Children to come unto me*, &c.

And here the Doctor falls into a Fit of *Angry Huff*; and charges me with *Troubling the World with Printing that over again, which was long ſince confuted by Mr.* Delaune, *in his Anſwer to Mr.* Walker's *Book.*

And

And the Truth is, that *Mr.* Delaune's *Anſwer* is juſt ſuch a *Confutation* of *Mr.* Walker's *Book*, as *Dr.* Ruſſel's *Book* is of my *Plain Letters:* Which is indeed ſo far from being a *Confutation* of them, that it little elſe but horrible Blunder and Miſtake, and downright Scurrilous Railery.

But I'll attend to what D^r *Ruſſel* has objected againſt the *Text* now in diſpute, from Mr *Delaune.*

And *Dr.* Taylor's *Excuſe* for them (which they have here produc'd) from this Text, ſhall be anſwer'd by Dr *Taylor* himſelf.

" * It was highly preceptive, ſays he when our Bleſſed Saviour " commanded that we ſhou'd *ſuffer little* " *Children to come to him*, and when they * *Great Exempl.* " came, they carry'd away a Bleſſing along p. 198. " with them. He was deſirous they ſhou'd " partake of his Merits. He is not willing, neither is it *His* " *Father's will, that any of theſe little ones ſhou'd periſh:* And there- " fore he Died for, and Loves, and Bleſſed them; and ſo he will " now, if they be brought to him, and preſented as Candidates " of his Religion. Chriſt hath a Bleſſing for our Children, but " let them come to him; that is, be preſented at the Doors of " the Church, to the Sacrament of Adoption and Initiation, " *(which is Baptiſm)* for I know no other Way for them to " come.

But ſays D^r *Ruſſel* from Mr *Delaune*, *Had it been the Practice of that Age to Baptize Infants, the Diſciples inſtead of rebuking thoſe that brought their Children to Chriſt, wou'd rather have encourag'd them thereto.*

To which we have an Anſwer in Mr *Delaune*'s own Words immediately following, where he tells us, that *The Diſciples rebuked not the People for bringing their Children to Chriſt; but the Ground of their Rebuke was, their unwillingneſs to have Chriſt too much preſt.*

It was not, it ſeems, their bringing their Children that the Diſciples rebuked them for; but only for the *Unſeaſonableneſs* of their ſo doing, when Chriſt had other *Multitudes* about him.

But D^r *Ruſſel* ſays farther from Mr *Delaune*, that *The End for which theſe Children were brought to Chriſt, was, that he ſhou'd touch them, in order to their Cure from Bodily Diſeaſes.*

To which I anſwer, in the Doctor's own Words; *I cannot think how theſe Gentlemen ſhou'd poſſibly believe themſelves, unleſs that Prophecy be fulfill'd in them, that God will turn the Wiſe Men backwards, and make their Knowledge Fooliſhneſs. For how coud it ever enter into the Heart of Mr.* Delaune, *or of* Dr. Ruſſel *to imagin,* That theſe Children were brought unto Chriſt, in order to be Cured of Bodily Infirmities.

Surely

Surely our Saviour knew for what End they were brought to him, and anſwer'd the Expectations of thoſe that brought them; and yet it is not ſaid, that *He laid his Hands upon them, and Healed them*; but, that *He laid his Hands upon them, and Bleſſed them.*

And to put this Matter out of all doubt, St *Matthew* ſays expreſly, that *Theſe Children were brought unto Chriſt, that he ſhou'd put his Hands upon them, and Pray.* Mat. 19. 13.

From whence 'tis plain, That they were not brought unto Chriſt, *To be Healed of Bodily Infirmities*; but that Chriſt, *By Praying for, and laying his Hands upon them*, ſhou'd confer upon them ſome *Spiritual Bleſſings.*

In the next place, the Doctor quarrels with my Interpretation of theſe Words, *To come unto me*; which (as I affirm'd from Mr *Walker*) ſignifie, *To become my Diſciples*; for ſo the Words, *Come unto me*, ſignifie. *Mat.* 11. 28. *Joh.* 3. 26. 5. 4.

But D^r *Ruſſel* will not have the words, *To come unto me*, in the Text in Hand; and *Come unto me*, in *Mat.* 11. 28. to intend the ſame Way of Coming to Chriſt. And why? Becauſe in *one Text* the words are ſpoken of *Infants*, and in the other of *Adult* Perſons, as he from Mr *Delaune* has taken ſome Pains to Prove.

But, Sir, Suppoſe that it were ſaid in one Place, That Children ſhall Riſe again at the Laſt Day; and in another, That Adult Perſons ſhall Riſe again at the Laſt Day. What? Wou'd you deny the ſame *Riſing again* to be intended in both theſe Places; becauſe in one Place the Words are ſuppoſed to be ſpoken of *Children*, and in the other of *Adult* Perſons.

I doubt not, but in this plain Inſtance the Weakneſs of your Argument will be diſcover'd, and therefore I will no farther expoſe it.

But I will appeal to a much higher Authority than that of your Mr *Delaune*, I mean the *Primitive Church*, which expounded this Text, *Suffer little Children to come unto me*, to mean their becoming Diſciples unto Chriſt by Baptiſm, as is plain from the unprofitable Pains which *Tertullian* took in a particular Caſe; or rather, (* ſays Dr *Tower-ſon*) the pitiful Evaſions he made uſe of, to take off the Force of it.

* *Of Baptiſm*, p. 311.

And indeed, I obſerv'd from Dr *Hammond*, That we may read the word *Proſelyte* (which is as much as to ſay, *Diſciple*) in the very Original Text, *Mat.* 19. 14. for there the words are, *Suffer little Children* (ἐλθεῖν πρὸς) *to be Proſelytes to me*, or, to be my *Diſciples.*

But

But this the Doctor was not pleaſed to take Notice of, nor of what I urg'd from the following Words, *For of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*; excepting this one little Cavil urged by him, That *The Church Militant is not here mention'd.*

I anſwer, That *Chriſt's Kingdom* here upon Earth, (which is the *Church Militant*) is very frequently meant by *the Kingdom of God*, and by *the Kingdom of Heaven.*

For thus, By *the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 11. 12. and by *the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 13. 2. and by *the Kingdom of God*, Mat. 13. 38. and by *the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 16. 19. and by *the Kingdom of God*, Mat. 21. 31. is meant the Church of Chriſt; and to become a Member of the Chriſtian Church, is expreſt by *Being Tranſlated into the Kingdom of Chriſt.* Col. 1. 13.

And accordingly, when it is ſaid of the little Children brought unto Chriſt, that *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*; it certainly implies, That they have a Right to *Church-Membership*, and are to be *ſuffer'd, and not forbidden*, even thus *to come unto Chriſt*; *viz.* To be admitted into his *Church*, which is meant by *the Kingdom of God*, of which *ſuch little Children* are here ſaid to be.

And here again, Dr *Ruſſel* does not, cannot deny, but *Allows, That all who are to be admitted into Chriſt's Church, muſt be brought in by the Door of Baptiſm.*

To confirm this Interpretation of this Text, which I affirm'd to be a plain Scripture-Proof, that *Children are to be admitted into Chriſt's Church*, I obſerv'd, That this is according to that Antient Prophecy foretelling the Converſion of the Gentiles to Chriſtianity: *Thus ſaith the Lord God, I will lift up my hand to the gentiles, and ſet up my ſtandard to the people, and they ſhall bring thy ſons in their arms, and thy daughters ſhall be carried upon their ſhoulders.*

Which Text, ſays Dr *Ruſſel*, is *Nothing to the Purpoſe*; and then to diſcover the Reſpect and Reverence which he pays to the Holy Word of God, he ſays, That theſe Words mean, *The* Gentiles *carrying the* Jew's *Daughters a pick-pack.* And is not this to make Work for Repentance with a Witneſs, to *Burleſque* and *Ridicule* the Holy Word of God at this wicked rate?

But to convince him that this Text is to the Purpoſe, he may be pleaſed to hear his Favourite Biſhop * *Taylor* concerning the Meaning of this Prophecy; who ſays, that

From the Beginning the Church hath Baptized the Infants of Chriſtian Parents, according to the Prophecy of Iſaiah, *I will lift up mine hands*, &c.

* *Great Exemplar*, p. 209.

I far-

I farther noted, That our Lord himſelf did plainly intimate, that there ſhou'd be *Lambs* in his *Flock*, as well as *Sheep*. Joh. 21. 15.

But ſo very zealous is Dr *Ruſſel*, *To ſhut up the Kingdom of Heaven*, (the Church of Chriſt) againſt *Infants*, (as the *Phariſees* did againſt Men, *Mat.* 23. 13.) that he will not ſuffer them to be meant by the *Lambs* in Chriſt's *Flock*.

No, but he will exclude all Infants out of the Sheepfold, rather than allow of their entring in at the Door of Baptiſm.

He denies, that *Children* belong to that *One Fold*, whereof *Chriſt Jeſus* is the *Great Shepherd*; he will rather herd them with St *Anthony*'s Pigs.

We read indeed, that *The Lord added to the Church daily ſuch as ſhou'd be ſaved*, Act. 2. 47. But Dr *Ruſſel* will not ſuffer little Children to be *ſo added*.

Again, We are told, that Chriſt is *the Saviour of his Body, the Church*, Eph. 5. 23. But Dr *Ruſſel* will not have Infants to be made any Parts or *Members of that Body whereof Chriſt is the Saviour*.

He peremptorily ſays, That *Children are not to be admitted to the Privilege of Members in the viſible Church of Chriſt, either by Baptiſm or any other Way*; *and demands of me to Prove it, if I can*.

And at his demand, to all the foregoing Proofs, I will here ſtill farther add this one Proof more.

I will obſerve, that *To give one a cup of water in the name of Chriſt*, Mark 9. 41. is called, a *Giving him a cup of water in the name of a Diſciple*. Mat. 10. 42.

But now, If to *give water to one in the name of Chriſt*, be to *give him water in the name of a Diſciple*; then to *receive one in the name of Chriſt*, is alſo to *receive him in the name of a Diſciple*.

And from hence it follows, That *Children* are ſo to be receiv'd, *viz.* as *Diſciples*; becauſe 'tis clearly intimated, That they are to be *received in the name of Chriſt*. Mat. 9. 48.

And this I think is a plain Proof, That Children are to be received into Chriſt's Church; for to be Diſciples, and to be Chriſtians, or Members of Chriſt's Church is the ſame thing.

I cou'd ſay much upon this Head, but will forbear at preſent, having already ſaid enough, in the Vindication of what I affirm'd concerning this Text, *Suffer little children to come unto me*, &c. *viz.* That it is a plain Scripture-Text, wherein our Bleſſed Lord has very clearly taught us, that *Little* Children *are to be ſuffer'd, and not not be forbidden, being admitted into his* Church.

In the ſecond place, I proceeded to prove, That our Bleſſed Lord has plainly taught, that *Little* Children *are to be admitted into the* Church *by Baptiſm*.

And

And this Dr *Ruſſel* ſays was *A Work wholly needleſs*: For if Children are to be admitted into Chriſt's Church, he grants, that they are to be *Baptized*; and acknowledges it to be true, that *There is no other Way of Admiſſion into Chriſt's* Church, *but by* Baptiſm.

However, I prov'd this from *Joh.* 3. 5. *Except a man be born of water and of the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*

Which Text, Dr *Ruſſel* allows to be ſpoken of *Water-Baptiſm*; and alſo, that by *the Kingdom of God*, is meant *the Viſible* Church *of* Chriſt; but he will not have Infants to be meant in this Text, tho' the Original Words (as he cannot deny) ſignifie expreſly, *Except any one be born of water*, &c.

He does indeed undertake to prove, That by *any One*, muſt only be meant *any Man*: For, ſays he, the Queſtion put to our Saviour by *Nicodemus* was, *How can a man be born again?* &c. And therefore our Saviour's Anſwer, if it be not a deluſive one, muſt be underſtood of *a Man* likewiſe.

To which I anſwer, That if we muſt, as he ſays, interpret the Words in our Saviour's Anſwer of the ſame Subjects ſpoken of by *Nicodemus*, then muſt the Words be interpreted of none but of *Old Men*; for *Nicodemus* his Queſtion was, *How can a man be born when he is old?* &c.

Again, I dare appeal to all unprejudic'd Perſons, Whether the Words may not be interpreted, according to the Literal Meaning of them, of all Mankind, and yet be an expreſs Anſwer to *Nicodemus* his Queſtion.

How can a man be born when he is old? ſays *Nicodemus*: To which our *Saviour* anſwers, *Verily, verily, except any one be born again*, &c. As if he had ſaid,

Nicodemus, I ſpeak not of a Natural, but of a Spiritual Birth; and thus muſt every one be born again, not only *Old Men*, but *all Mankind, no Sex or Age excluded.* For, *Except any one (whoſoever, or of what Age ſoever he be, except he) be born again of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.*

And this is a direct Anſwer to *Nicodemus* his Queſtion, and 'tis what the Original Words do literally ſignifie, ἐὰν μή τις· *Except any one*, &c. And I hope that this Interpretation does not imply our Saviour to be a *Deceiver*, as Dr *Ruſſel* wou'd inſinuate.

But the Doctor ſays farther, That *New-born-Infants are not at all intended in this Text which ſpeaks of a Spiritual Birth: For New-born-Infants, conſider'd as ſuch, have no other Birth than that after the Fleſh.*

And 'tis very true, that they have not, 'till they are *Born again, of Water and of the Spirit*, that is, *Baptized*; which is ſo far from being a Reaſon againſt, that 'tis a very ſtrong one to perſuade us to Baptize our Children.

For thus, when our Saviour had ſaid, *That which is born of fleſh is fleſh*; he from thence inferr'd the Neceſſity of a *Spiritual Birth*, *Ye* muſt *be born again.* Joh. 3. 6, 7.

And thus * Bp *Taylor*: "In Baptiſm we are Born again, and "this Infants need in the preſent Circumſtances, and for the "ſame great Reaſon, that Men of Age and "Reaſon do: For our Natural Birth is "either of it ſelf inſufficient, or is made ſo "by the Fall of *Adam*, and the conſequent "Evils, that Nature alone, or our Firſt Birth, cannot bring us to "Heaven, which is a Supernatural End; that is, an End above "all the Powers of our Nature, as now it is. So that if *Nature* "cannot bring us to Heaven, *Grace* muſt: Or we can never get "thither; if the *Firſt Birth* cannot, a *Second* muſt; but the "*Second Birth* ſpoken of in Scripture, is *Baptiſm*: *A Man muſt* "*be Born of Water, and of the Spirit*; and therefore Baptiſm is "λοῦτρον παλιγγενεσίας, The Laver of a New Birth. *Tit.* 3. 5. "Either then Infants cannot go to Heaven any Way that we "know of, or they muſt be Baptized.

* *Great Exemplar*, p. 200, 201.

The Biſhop undoubtedly means, That *ordinarily* Baptiſm is neceſſary to Salvation; which is the Neceſſity generally taught by the *Primitive Church*, as well as by the *Church of* England.

And indeed, notwithſtanding all that the Doctor cou'd ſay againſt Infants being meant, as well as Men and Women, by theſe Words, *Except any one be born again*, &c. as if he had deſpair'd of his weak Proofs, he deſires me to take Notice, That (tho' Children ſhou'd be here meant, yet that) ſome Learned and Judicious Divines ſay, That *Baptiſm is not at all intended in this Text.*

I anſwer, That the Primitive Writers do generally interpret the Text of Baptiſm, and ſo do the *moſt* Learned, and *moſt* Judicious Divines of all Ages.

And they who deny it, diſarm themſelves of the cleareſt Proof in Scripture for *Water-Baptiſm*, againſt the *Quakers*.

And becauſe Dr *Ruſſel* owns the Words to be ſpoken of Baptiſm, I ſhall not need to add any more upon this Head.

And therefore to conclude, Dr *Ruſſel* agrees with me in this, that *There is no other Way of Admiſſion into Chriſt's Church, but by Baptiſm.*

And from hence he argues, That becauſe *Children are not to be Baptized, therefore they are not to be admitted to the Privilege of Members, in the Viſible Church of Chriſt.*

In which Argument, there is not one Syllable of Truth; for I have prov'd the oppoſite Argument to be true, *viz.*

That Children are to be admitted into Chriſt's Church; for ſo

ſays

ſays our Saviour, *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of ſuch is the kingdom of God.* And therefore they muſt be Baptized: For ſo ſays our Saviour again, *Except any one be born of water and of the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*

A Juſt Vindication of LETTER VII.

I Was engag'd here to inquire, Whether *Infant-Baptiſm* was taught by our Saviour after his Death and Reſurrection, before he aſcended into Heaven.

And I obſerv'd, That all that our Lord taught or commanded at that time concerning Baptizing with Water, may be readily found in theſe two Texts, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 15, 16.

In the firſt of which Texts, I took Notice that the Original words ſignifie, *Go ye therefore*, and diſciple *all nations, baptizing them*, &c.

And I plainly prov'd, That the Apoſtles (not knowing any other Way of Diſcipling the Nations, but this of Diſcipling the Children together with their Fathers, that they) cou'd not poſſibly underſtand the Commiſſion in any narrower ſenſe, than as reaching to the Children, as well as to the Fathers and Elder People.

And that there is nothing in the words to exclude Children, I likewiſe ſhew'd from other parallel Speeches, which Dr *Ruſſel* is pleaſed out of his great Abundance, to beſtow a few Ill Words upon; to call them, *A Parcel of Idle and Impertinent Stories and Whimſies*; and angrily to cry out, that what I here ſaid, is *all Fooling, and deſerves to be laught at; inſtead of giving it the Countenance of a Solid Anſwer.*

I wou'd have thank'd him, if inſtead of all this Scolding, he had like a Scholar, fairly ſhew'd me wherein I was guilty of all theſe Fooleries and ridiculous Whimſies and Impertinences, which he ſo paſſionately exclaims againſt; and I perſuade my ſelf, that it was not out of Civility to me, that he did not.

Nay but I will appeal to any indifferent Reader of my Letter, Whether this be not a plain Trick of Dr *Ruſſel*'s, to get off from the Point, and to run away from what he cou'd not anſwer.

And I muſt take leave to tell him upon this Occaſion, That was he not an abſolute Maſter of the *Billingſgate*-Sentences, he wou'd be frequently ſpeechleſs; he wou'd not have ſo much as one Good Word to ſay for his bad Cauſe. But to proceed.

I had charged the Men of his Perſuaſion, That they *narrowly* interpreted our Lord's *Commiſſion.*

And this Dr. Ruſſel *ſolemnly declares againſt, and ſays, that they refuſe to Baptize none, whom Chriſt has commanded them to Baptize in the Commiſſion; and that they never enter'd their Exceptions againſt any part of it.*

To which I anſwer, That they refuſe to Baptize Infants, and enter their Exceptions againſt Infant-Baptiſm; and in ſo doing, they *refuſe to Baptize*, and *enter their Exceptions againſt them, whom our Lord has commanded to be Baptized in the Commiſſion.*

For, ſays their good Friend Biſhop *Taylor*, * *Baptize all Nations, muſt ſignifie all that it can ſignifie, all that are reckon'd in the Capitations and Accounts of Nations.* And ſurely Infants are ſo reckon'd.

* *Great Exemplar*, p. 197.

But Dr *Ruſſel*, to ſhift off the Charge of narrowly interpreting our Lord's Commiſſion, has the Confidence to ſay, that *We do narrowly interpret it, becauſe we ſeldom or never Baptize any Believing Men or Women.*

I anſwer, That we never refuſe to Baptize any Believing Men or Women, unleſs they have been already Baptized. If indeed they have been before Baptized, we then refuſe to Rebaptize them, becauſe we dare not be guilty of *Anabaptiſm.*

But the Doctor ſays farther, That *Infants are not at all mention'd in the Commiſſion.* To which I anſwer, that they are as much mention'd, as either *Men* or *Women*; for the words in the Commiſſion are, *all Nations.*

Dr *Ruſſel* ſays again, that *The Apoſtles did not underſtand our Lord's Commiſſion to command Infant-Baptiſm, becauſe they neither taught nor practis'd it.*

I anſwer, That they did underſtand our Lord's Commiſſion to command Infant-Baptiſm, becauſe they did both teach and practiſe it; as I have already prov'd, and will farther prove in the Vindication of my next Letter.

But now the Doctor comes to conſider the Commiſſion it ſelf, wherein he obſerves, That it was given by Chriſt to the Apoſtles; and that it commiſſion'd and commanded them *to make Diſciples*; (*which he allows to be the proper Signification, and Scripture-uſe of the word* μαθητεύσατε.) Go ye, and Diſciple all Nations.

But how were they *to make Diſciples? They* (ſays he) *were to Teach and to Preach the Goſpel to them; and upon their Believing, they were to Baptize them.*

But this is more than can be prov'd from the Order of our Saviour's Words; in which there are not (as he ſays there are) *Three diſtinct Works* enjoyn'd the Apoſtles: Firſt, *To make Diſciples*; Secondly, *To Baptize them*, Thirdly, *To Teach them.*

For the words are not, *Diſciple all Nations, and Baptize them,*

and

and Teach them; but, *Diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them, and Teaching them.*

In which Words we have indeed, Firſt, The Great Work to be done by the Apoſtles, *viz. To make Diſciples.* But then Secondly, We have the Ways and Means, whereby this Great Work is to be done; *viz. Baptizing* and *Teaching.*

For thus, to make any *Diſciples* to Chriſt, is to make them his *Scholars*, (as Dr *Ruſſel* has prov'd:) And how are they to be made his *Scholars*, but by being admitted into his *School*, there to be *taught?* And how are they to be admitted into his *School*, but by Baptiſm? For the *School* of Chriſt, is his *Church*; and Dr *Ruſſel* acknowledges, that *There is no other Way of Admittance into Chriſt's Church, but by Baptiſm.*

And now the true and genuine Meaning of the Words in our Lord's Commiſſion appears to be this; *Go ye therefore, and make Diſciples* (or Scholars) *to me among all Nations, admitting them into my Church* (or School) *by Baptiſm; and there teaching them to obſerve all things, whatſoever I have commanded you.*

But Dr *Ruſſel* objects, That *Infants are not to be made Diſciples or Scholars*; and conſequently, *are not to be admitted into Chriſt's School* (the Church) *to be Taught, becauſe they are not capable to Learn.*

To which a very Learned Perſon has thus anſwer'd: " * Although they are not in the propereſt and " neareſt Capacity to Learn, yet it doth not " therefore follow, that they are in no ſuch " Capacity of it, as that they may be called " and reputed to be Diſciples or Learners.

* *Perſuaſive to Peace and Unity*, p. 54, 55.

" The Scripture uſeth to reckon or impute the doing of things " to Children, when yet they have been but in as remote a " Capacity of Doing thoſe things, as they are of Learning.

" Thus little Children are ſaid to enter into Covenant, *Deut.* " 29. 11, 12. to keep Covenant, and to break Covenant, *Gen.* " 17. 10, 14. and the Children of the *Kohothites* of a Month old, " were ſaid to keep the Charge of the Sanctuary, *Numb.* 3. 28. " and *Levi* to pay Tithes in *Abraham*, while he was yet in his " Loyns, *Heb.* 7. 9, 10.

" Now for whatſoever Reaſons, theſe Children were ſaid to do " ſuch things while but Children; for the ſame Reaſons may little " Children while but ſuch, be as truly ſaid to be Diſciples or " Scholars.

And he goes on, undeniably proving, That ſuch Children, as well as their Fathers, are really called *Diſciples*, Act. 15. 10.

And indeed, when Infants are Baptized into the Church or School of Chriſt, they are thereby put into the Way, and brought under

under an Engagement to Learn his Doctrine, and to Obey his Laws; and ſo they are truly Diſciples.

The truth is, to prop up this *rotten corrupt Notion*, That Infants are not to be made Diſciples of Chriſt, Dr *Ruſſel* is forced to ſhut them out of the Church of Chriſt.

And yet he cannot deny, but that once they were Church-Members; and I do not find, either when, or by whom they were again unchurch'd.

Sure I am, that their very *Circumciſion* was not laid aſide without great Conteſt and Strife; and can we think, that their Church-Membership wou'd have been parted withal, without ſo much as one Word ſaid about it?

Nay but rather, won'd it not have been a great Stumbling-Block both to the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and enough to have kept them out of the Church of Chriſt for ever, had it been ſo that their Children, together with themſelves, might not have been admitted into the Chriſtian Church?

But I ſaid enough of this, in the Vindication of my foregoing Letter; and therefore to paſs on:

Amongſt a deal of hard Language and baſe Words, I find Dr *Ruſſel* objecting again, That *If all Nations, without any Limitation, or without any previous Qualifications, are to be Baptized, then are all Unrighteous Perſons, whether Thieves, Murtherers, or Drunkards, or Revilers, &c. to be Baptized; and thus*, ſays he, *wou'd the Church be filled with the Diſciples of the Devil.*

But, Sir, I ſhall have Occaſion hereafter to ſhew you, That tho' they who ſtand in need of Repentance, muſt firſt Repent, before they are to be Baptized; yet this does not hinder, but that Infants, who need not Repentance, may be Baptized, without any ſuch previous Qualification.

Or thus, 'Tis true, that Thieves and Murtherers, *&c.* are not to be Baptized without their Repentance; but yet it does not follow, that innocent Babes muſt firſt repent too, before they are to be admitted into the Church by Baptiſm.

Indeed, they who are in a State of Unbelief, as all Infidels are; and they who are in a State of Impenitence, as all Wicked Men for the time being are, Faith and Repentance muſt be Preached to ſuch Men (as the Apoſtles Preached to the wicked and unbelieving *Jews* and *Gentiles*) and they muſt be converted out of their Unbelieving and Impenitent States, before they be Baptized.

But why? Becauſe they muſt become as little Children, (who are neither in a State of Unbelief, nor Impenitence) before they can enter, or be admitted by Baptiſm, into that Kingdom of God, which is the Church of Chriſt.

But

But if they must first become as little Children, before they be Baptized into Christ's Church, then certainly such little Children must likewise be Baptized into it: For if *such as they*, then surely they themselves are to *enter into the Kingdom of God*; that is, they are to be enter'd *Disciples* or *Scholars*, by being Baptized into the *Church* or *School* of Christ, in order to their after Learning the Lessons of Christianity.

The Case in short is this: Tho' the wicked and unbelieving Pagans of old were not *Circumcised* into God's Church, before they profest their Conversion out of their wicked and Infidel-State, and that they believed in the God of *Israel*; yet upon this their Conversion and Profession of Faith, not only themselves, but their Children and Infants of Eight Days old, were *Circumcised* also.

In like manner, tho' wicked and unbelieving *Jews* and *Gentiles* were not by the Apostles Baptized into the Church of Christ, before they profest their Repentance, and Conversion out of their wicked and unbelieving State, and that they Believed in Jesus; yet upon this their Conversion, and Profession of Faith, not only themselves, but their Children likewise, were Baptized with them.

And this was according to the true Intent and Meaning of the *Commission*; and I will again say, That I am very heartily persuaded, that Infant-Baptism was here taught by our Saviour after his Death and Resurrection, before he ascended into Heaven: *Go ye, Disciple all Nations*, (Infants not excepted) *Baptizing them*, &c.

But then at the same time, between his Resurrection and Ascension, we find, that he also commanded his Apostles, to *Go into all the world*, and to *Preach the Gospel to every creature*; *he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved*; *he that believeth not, shall be damned*, Mark 16. 15, 16.

From which Words, I took notice of this Objection started by our Adversaries, *viz.* that *None but Believers are to be Baptized.*

To which I particularly answer'd, and shew'd from other the like Forms of Speech, That no such Conclusion can be drawn from these Words, which are not, *Except ye Believe, ye shall not be Baptized*; nor, *He who Believeth not, shall not be Baptized*; nor, *Let a Man first Believe, and then let him be Baptized:* No, there are no such Sayings in the whole *New Testament.*

And Dr *Russel* takes no farther Notice of what I said upon this Text; but only charges me with concluding from it, That *Children have Faith, and therefore may be Baptized.*

In

In anſwer to which, I ſhall but need to repeat the Words which he alludes to, and they are theſe.

" Infants either have Faith, according to the meaning of this " Text, or they have not: If they have ſuch Faith, then they may " be Baptized, as our Adverſaries themſelves will grant. But if " they have not Faith according to the meaning of this Text, what " ſhall I ſay then? E'en the Lord have Mercy upon them; " that they may not Dye in that Faithleſs Infant-State; for the " Text ſays poſitively, that *He who Believeth not, ſhall be Damned.*

" Nothing can be plainer, than that this Text ſpeaks of Faith in " ſuch a Senſe, as makes the want of it Damning: But that " Infants want Faith, ſo as to be damn'd for want of it, may my " Tongue cleave to the Roof of my Mouth, rather than ſay ſo.

And now, muſt not the Man be ſtrangely blinded with Prejudice, or ſomething worſe, that can ſee any ſuch Concluſion in theſe words, as that *Children have Faith.*

My Concluſion was, That Children do not want Faith in the meaning of this Text; that is, they do not want Faith ſo as to be Damn'd for want of it; they are not guilty of ſuch a Damning Unbelief as is here ſpoken of, *He who believeth not, ſhall be damned.*

And having thus vindicated my ſelf from the Doctor's Charge, and this being all that he has objected againſt my Diſcourſe upon this Text, I ſhall not need to add any thing farther in the Vindication of it.

A Juſt Vindication of LETTERS VIII, *and* IX.

ENQUIRING here, whether Infant-Baptiſm was taught, or commanded by the Apoſtles of our Lord after his Aſcenſion into Heaven, I prove that it was in theſe words, *Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remiſſion of ſins, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt; for the promiſe is to you, and to your children.* Act. 2. 38.

To which Dr *Ruſſel* replies, that, *The Words were not ſpoken to Children, but to Men; and reviles me for ſaying, that they may very well be ſuppoſed to have been ſpoken to Infants.*

I was indeed obviating an Objection, which is commonly rais'd from theſe words, *viz.* that *Repentance ought to go before Baptiſm.*

And

And here it was that I ſaid, that the Apoſtle may very well be ſuppoſed to have ſpoken to Infants and Children, even when he ſaid *Repent.*

And my Reaſons were theſe; becauſe I find *Little-ones and Children* concern'd in the Exerciſes of Repentance, 2 *Chron.* 20. 13. and again, *Children and ſuch as ſucked the breaſt*, Joel 2. 16. But this is more than the Doctor was at leiſure to take notice of.

But let me ask you, Sir, Don't you here ſee *Little-ones* and *Children* mention'd together; and again, *Children and ſuch as ſucked the breaſt*: And is not this as much, as *Infants and Children?*

And will you now ſtand to what you have ſaid, that *This is fooliſhly worded.* Sir, If you muſt and will at every turn be ſpitting your Venom at me, pray take Care for the future that it fly not into the Faces of the Inſpired Pen-Men of the Holy Scriptures.

But Secondly, I added, That tho' Children cou'd not be concern'd in St *Peter's* Exhortation to *Repent*, yet this will be no juſt Cauſe or Impediment, why they may not be concerned in the following words, *Be Baptized every one of you.*

For, as I ſhew'd by other the like Schemes of Speech, when he ſaid, *Repent, and be Baptized, every one of you*; he cou'd only mean, that Perſons qualify'd for Baptiſm muſt not be in an Impenitent State.

And from hence it follows, That tho' they who are in an Impenitent State muſt firſt Repent, before they can be fit for Baptiſm, yet they who are not in an Impenitent State, (as Children are not) are the very Perſons qualify'd and fit for Baptiſm, without any more ado.

And this (as I obſerv'd) was the Caſe of our Bleſſed Lord himſelf, who needed no Repentance; and therefore did not firſt Repent, and yet was Baptized, as well as they who did firſt Repent, becauſe they needed Repentance.

And ſure D^r *Ruſſel* was in a drowzy Fit, when he read all this; he has not a Word to ſay to it.

I then proceeded to the Promiſe annext to this Exhortation of St *Peter*, whereby it ſtill more evidently appears, that he has here taught the Baptiſm of Children: For,

To perſuade them to be Baptized every one of them; *Be Baptized*, ſaid he, *and ye ſhall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt*; and leſt they ſhou'd miſtake him, as not meaning their Children, together with themſelves, he expreſly adds, *For the Promiſe is to you, and to your Children.*

And here the Doctor begins to awake, and rouzes, and runs to Biſhop *Taylor*, and *deſires me to anſwer the Plea which that Biſhop has made for them.*

Sir, I told you before, That what that Biſhop Pleaded for you, was but by way of *Excuſe*; *To ſhew the fair and plauſible Pretences, whereby you are cozen'd and deceiv'd.*

And as that Bishop speaks, *Since from him you have taken your Arguments, from him (if you please) you shall receive Answers to undeceive you.*

Now the *Arguments*, so far as I can gather them out of your long Citation, are these.

First, *That Little Children are not meant by Children in this Text.*

Secondly, *That the Promise of the Holy Ghost is not made to Baptism, but to Imposition of Hands.*

Thirdly, *Supposing the Promise of the Holy Ghost be made to Children, yet it will not follow, that they are to be Baptized; for they that are capable of the Grace, are not always capable of the Sign.*

First, You argue from the Bishop, *That Little Children are not meant by the Children in this Text.*

And since from the Bishop you have taken this Argument, from him you shall likewise receive an Answer to undeceive you. "It is in "our Case, * says he, as it was with the *Jews* "Children. Our Children are a *Holy Seed*, for if "it were not so with Christianity, how could S^t. Pe- "ter move the *Jews* to Christianity, by telling "them, *The Promise was to them, and to their Children.* Thus he applies the Text to Little Children, and goes on to prove *Infant-Baptism* from it, beyond all reasonable Contradiction.

* *Great Exemplar*, p. 206.

Secondly, You argue from the Bishop, *That the Promise of the Holy Ghost is not made to Baptism, but to Imposition of Hands.*

To which you may take this Answer from him again, to undeceive you in this too. "The Holy Ghost, † says he, descends upon the Waters of "Baptism, and makes them prolifical, apt to pro- "duce Children unto God; and therefore S^t. *Leo* "compares the Font of Baptism to the Womb of "the Blessed Virgin, when it was replenisht with the Holy Ghost. And "this is the Baptism of our dearest Lord; his Ministers Baptize with "Water, our Lord at the same time verifies their Ministry with giving "the Holy Spirit. This he proves from 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. and *Joh.* 3. 5.

† *Ibid.* p. 184.

* "And again, from Children's having a Right to the Water of the "Sacrament, he argues, that they shall receive the Promise of the "Holy Spirit, the Benefits of the Sacrament; or "else (says he) their Privilege is none at all, but "a Dish of cold Water, which every Village "Nurse can provide for her new-born Babe.

* *Ibid.* p. 206.

Thirdly, You argue from the Bishop: *Supposing the Promise of the Holy Spirit to be made to Children, yet it will not follow that they are to be Baptized for they that are capable of the Grace, are not always capable of the Sign.*

But here again to undeceive you, the Bishop thus answers: † "This is certain, that Children "have

† *Ibid.* p. 204.

" have ſome Effects of the Spirit; and therefore do receive it, and " are Baptized with the Spirit; and therefore may with Water.

And again, " If Infants are capable of receiving * *Ibid.* p. 205.
" the Spirit of Grace, there is no reaſon but they
" may and ought to be Baptized, as well as Men and Women; unleſs
" God hath expreſly forbidden them, which cannot be pretended.

‖ And again, " If Children have the Spirit, ſays he, nothing can
" hinder them from a Title to the Water.

‡ And for a final Anſwer to this, " If (ſays he) ‖ *Ibid.* p. 206.
" Children can receive Spiritual Effects, they can ‡ *Ibid.* p. 202.
" alſo receive the Outward Sacrament; this being
" deny'd, only upon pretence that they cannot have the other.

And now Dr *Ruſſel*, I muſt deſire you to obſerve, That the *Outward Sacrament of Baptiſm* is affirm'd by Dr *Taylor* to be deny'd to *Children*, upon this Pretence, that they cannot have the *Inward Part*.

And yet, when I took notice of this Pretence, *viz.* of Infants being uncapable of receiving the Holy Spirit, which is the Inward Part of Baptiſm, *You* confidently and angerly *deny it to be any Objection of yours; and affirm it to be a Figment of my Brain, to amuſe my poor ignorant Admirers.* And then you ſay, that *I beſtir my ſelf, and lay about me, to beat down the Man of Straw which I have ſet up*; and you add, that *None of thoſe who have written in defence of your Practice, uſe to talk at this looſe rate.*

Good God! To what a State are we now arriv'd? That a Man can preſume in the Face of the World to utter ſo many Falſities with one Breath. If you are reſolv'd, Sir, to brazen us down at this rate, 'tis to no purpoſe to contend with you. Surely you think to fright me with hard Words, and that you may take the Liberty to ſay what you pleaſe, and that I muſt not dare to contradict you.

And really, Sir, I am ſorry that I muſt tell you, who pretend to have been of the Univerſity of *Cambridge*, that you have loſt your Brains, or your Conſcience, or both, in this Scolding-fit of yours; all that you have here ſaid, is perfect Impudence and Braſs, there's not a Syllable of Truth in it.

What you call, *A Figment of my Brain, and a Man of Straw ſet up by me*; was an Obſervation made by Biſhop *Taylor* (and others) long before I had any Hand in it.

And your affirming, that *None of your Perſuaſion uſe to talk at this looſe rate*, is as groſs an Untruth as can well be publiſh'd.

You know, Sir, that *Mr.* Fiſher *writ in defence of your Practice*; and you have commended his Writings to the World. And yet,

‡ *'Tis an utter Untruth*, ſays *Mr.* Fiſher, *to utter any ſuch thing, as that Infancy have the Holy Spirit.* And again, *Neither all Infants have the Holy Spirit, nor any at all in ſuch Non-age, as ſome falſly ſuppoſing they have it, do thereupon Baptize in.* ‡ Διάλογος τριῶν λόγων, p. 66, 67, 68.

And then he goes on to ſhew, in what Senſes Perſons may be ſaid to have the Holy Spirit; and then, ſays he, *The Holy Spirit is not at all in Infancy, in any of theſe Senſes; and as I cannot find the Holy Spirit in them, ſo neither do I find any Promiſe of the Holy Spirit made to them in their Non-age.* And thus I think that Mr *Fiſher* has ſpoken out, and very plainly, as to this Matter.

† See *Religious Conference*, p. 74.

And yet † Mr *Keach* (another Writer in defence of your Practice) ſpeaks it out in much broader Language than this ſtill. *'Tis as fruitleſs* (ſays he) *to call upon God to ſend his Holy Spirit upon Infants, as to pray him to illuminate a Stone, or a Tree.*

And now Dr *Ruſſel*, what think you of your Writers? Was it *A Figment of my Brain?* Or did I *Set up a Man of Straw*, when I ſaid, that they deny'd Children to be capable of receiving the Holy Spirit?

However, I thank you, Sir, for owning that they *Talk at a looſe rate*, who talk thus of Infants; and I commend you in this, for diſcovering your ſelf to have a better Opinion of the Little Babes; and for acknowledging, that they are capable of being Sanctify'd with the Holy Spirit, notwithſtanding all the *looſe Talk of your Writers* to the contrary.

But now, Sir, I muſt obſerve to you, That * Mr *Tombes*, (one of your Learned'ſt Writers) grants, That *All who partake of the Inward Grace, may alſo partake of the Outward Sign*, (which is Water,) and ſays, that *None of your Way will deny it.*

* See Mr *Marſhal's* Defence of Infant-Baptiſm, p. 219.

† And again, ſays he, *If it cou'd be known,* (and you, Dr *Ruſſel*, acknowledge it) *that Children have the Inward Grace, 'tis granted, that they may be Baptized; and that they who are thus intituled, are not for want of an Inſtitution to be excluded from it.*

† *Idem ibid.* p. 232.

In ſhort, you own (and 'tis very true) that *Infants are capable of receiving the Holy Spirit*; and then your Learned Mr *Tombes* does in effect ſay, (as St *Peter* once did) *Can any man forbid water, that they ſhou'd not be baptized, who receive the Holy Ghoſt, as well as we?*

And thus in the Text now in hand, when St *Peter* ſaid, *Be baptized every one of you, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt:* He plainly taught, That all are to be Baptized, who are capable of Receiving the Holy Ghoſt. But of this Little Children are acknowledged by Dr *Ruſſel* to be capable, therefore they are to be Baptized.

But,

But, says he, *'Tis a foolish Imagination, to suppose, that the Sprinkling of a little Water shou'd convey Grace to the Infants, and Regenerate them.* And he says moreover, that *This is to make of Baptism a Charm or Conjuration.*

But that Baptism is a Means whereby the Holy Spirit is receiv'd, I have sufficiently prov'd, in the *Vindication* of my *First Letter.*

And yet I will here add, That I do not suppose, (as this Doctor maliciously insinuates) that the Benefit of the Sacrament is receiv'd by the mere *Opus operatum*, or Work done. No, but I believe that the Benefit of it depends upon the Blessing annext to the Institution.

I believe (I say) that the Water in Baptism is, by the Divine Blessing accompanying the Institution, effectual to the washing away of Sins, and Spiritual Regeneration.

And thus Dr *Tillotson* late Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in his *Discourse of* Transubstantiation: *The Spiritual Efficacy of the Sacrament*, (and 'tis true of both the Sacraments) *doth not depend upon the Nature of the Thing receiv'd. Supposing we receive what our Lord appointed, and receive it with a right Preparation and Disposition of Mind: But upon the Supernatural Blessing that goes along with it, and makes it effectual to those Spiritual Ends, for which it was appointed.*

And this was the Doctrine of the *Primitive Church*; and I find it was the true and common Faith of the *Church of* England in particular, above Seven Hundred Years ago; as may be seen in that Homily translated by *Elfrick* (or *A'frick*) out of some *Latin* Author, into the *Saxon* Language.

This *Saxon* Homily was read in the Church every *Easter*-Sunday, as an Authoriz'd Homily; in which was nothing of Substance contain'd, but what was the common receiv'd Doctrine of the whole *Church of* England.

And as it is a most admirable Testimony against *Transubstantiation*, so there is an eminent Passage in it, which evidently confirms the Thing that I am asserting; and also, that *Infant-Baptism* was taught and practis'd thro'-out the *Church of* England, in those Days. For thus we read in it:

An Heathen-Child is Christened, yet he altereth not hys Shape without, though he be chaunged within: He is brought to the Font-Stone sinful, through Adam's *Disobedience; howbeit, he is Washed from all Sinne within, though he hath not altered hys Shape without: Even so the Holy-Font-Water, that is called the Well-spryng of Life, is lyke in Shape to other Waters, and is subject to Corruption; but the Holy Ghostes Myght cometh to the corruptible Water through the Priest's Blessing,*

and

and it may after that Wash the Body and Soul from all Sin, through Ghostly Myght. Behold now, we see two things in this one Creature; after true Nature, the Water is Corruptible Water, but after Ghostly Mystery, it hath an Hallowing Myght.

Which Noble and Ancient Testimony is so plain, and full to our present Purpose, that I shall not need to descant upon't.

And may I not now conclude, That Baptism is a * Moral Means of conveying the Holy Spirit, without any Charm or Conjuration: I mean, that it so far contributes towards our Partaking of the Holy Spirit, as it is a Means to which God hath annexed the Promise of the Holy Spirit, in this very Text; *Be Baptized every one of you, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is to you, and to your children.*

* *See* Hooker's *Eccl. Pol. lib.* 5. *sect.* 57.

And that is as much as to say, *The Promise of the Holy Ghost is to you and to your Children; and therefore, be Baptized every one of you, you and your Children, that ye may receive it.*

I had here concluded my Vindication of this Letter, had not Dr *Russel* taken an Occasion in this place to give us an Account of the Abuses of Baptism in the *Church of* Rome. From whence he would make the World believe, That the *Priests of the Church of Rome*, and the *Priests of the Church of* England, are *Learned Blockheads* alike.

Learned Blockheads! And can you, Civil Sir, talk of *Whimsies*, and *Mysterious Nonsence*; and not see the *Whimsie* and *Mysterious Nonsence* in your own Rude and Clownish Expression?

Learned Blockheads! The very Terms are a Contradiction; and you might with as much good Sense, and less Ill-meaning have talk'd like a *Mountebank*, of *Curing Incurable Diseases.*

But, pray, Sir; Why do you here trouble us with the Abuses of Baptism in the Church of *Rome?* To what End doth it serve, in this Place? Oh now I think on't, 'Tis to let us know, that *The Ministration of Baptism in the Church of* Rome, and *The Ministration of Baptism in the Church of* England, are as like one another, as *Black* and *White* are: And consequently, that it was *knowingly* and *wilfully*, that Dr *Russel* vented a most *Impudent Falshood*, when he call'd the *Common-Prayer-Book*, the *Mass-Book translated into* English.

But the Doctor having got hold of something that was like enough to a Charm in the Church of *Rome*, he was so nettled with the pretty Conceit of a Charm, that he could not forbear to rub me with it.

Sir, says he, *to be plain with you, you do like a Conjurer that walks in a Circle; for you plead for Infants at one time, that they have the Spirit,*

Spirit; and therefore may be Baptized. And at another time, that they are to be Baptized, that the Spirit may be convey'd to them by the Water of Baptism; if this ben't a Circle, I know not what is. And whilst you are dancing about it, you suppose you are secure, whereas it is nothing else but Mysterious Nonsence, without any Authority from Scripture, &c.

Good dear Sir, not so fast; let us pause a little, and consider the Circle in my Book.

Can any man forbid water, says St *Peter, that these shou'd not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we.* Act. 10. 47. Here the Apostle pleads, That *They who have the Spirit, may also be Baptized with Water.* Which is one half of the *Circle* you speak of.

And again, *Be baptized, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost*, says the same Apostle, *Act.* 2. 38. And he here exhorts them to be Baptized, that *the Holy Spirit may be convey'd to them by the Water of Baptism*; which is the other half of the Circle, as you call it.

And now, Sir, Is this *nothing else but Mysterious Nonsence, and without Authority from Scripture?*

Or can you blame me, for *supposing my self secure in a Circle* (if you will call it so) which is all plain Scripture, and made up of the very Words of St *Peter*, or rather of the *Holy Spirit* of God by St *Peter's* Mouth?

Let me beseech you, Sir, as you tender the Honour of God the Holy Ghost, to lay your Hand upon your Heart, and seriously to consider, upon whom your Charge of *Conjuration* falls.

Oh, Sir, Consider with your self, what kind of Blasphemy it is, to ascribe to the *Devil*, what is said or done by the *Holy Spirit of God.*

I must meekly tell you, Dr *Russel*, that this Passage in your Book is such a rank Piece of Blasphemy, as I have not met with the like; and that it deserves much severer Language, than I shall bestow upon it.

Pray look to it, without Prejudice, and without Partiality; and do not blind your Eyes, but see what your bitter Pen hath vented, and recant these Cholerick Blasphemous Words, or be for ever silent.

I wou'd here have taken my Leave of Dr *Russel* for this time, had he not past a little peevish Reflexion upon my *Ninth Letter*, which I am oblig'd to take notice of.

In that *Ninth and last Letter in my Book*, I shew'd, That by Baptism we are admitted into the New Covenant, and that Children are capable of being admitted into that Covenant; yea that they ought to be admitted, because it is the one and only Covenant by which both we and our Children are to be saved.

And

And this I did ſo plainly prove, that Dr *Ruſſel* had not one Word to ſay againſt it; he has not medled with it at all.

'Tis true, in that Letter I had a fair Opportunity (and comply'd with it) to juſtifie not only the Lawfulneſs, but the Reaſonableneſs and Advantage of Children's having God-Fathers and God-Mothers at their Baptiſm.

And this Dr *Ruſſel* takes juſt ſo much Notice of, as to call it, * *A long-winded Diſcourſe about Odd-Fathers and Odd-Mothers*; and to † ſay, that *He cou'd detect the Ignorance and Folly that appears in what I ſaid about Odd-Fathers and Odd-Mothers*: But, good Man, he wou'd not.

* *See his Epiſt. Dedicat.*

† *See his Book, pag.* 141.

But why this pretty Nick-Name, *Odd-Fathers and Odd-Mothers*; Did the Doctor thinks himſelf witty?

Indeed he puts me in mind of a vain looſe Fellow, who wou'd needs ſhew his Wit (or Folly rather) in reading 1 *Cor.* 15. 51, 52. where the words are, *We ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be* changed, *in a moment*, &c.

But now the prophane Wretch to make himſelf (and others like himſelf) merry, he left out the firſt Letter in the word *changed*, and read thus, *We ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be* hanged, *in a moment*, &c.

Which was a ſilly, fooliſh, wicked, prophane Witticiſm; and as like Dr *Ruſſel*'s, as if it had been ſpit out of his Mouth.

And now, Sir, when you Write again, let me beſeech you to be a little more ſerious, and a little more civil; uſe ſuch Language as becomes a *Scholar*, a *Gentleman*, and a *Chriſtian*; and then you ſhall find me a very fair and candid Adverſary.

But if you proceed in your Scurrilous Way, and go on *Railing* and *Reviling*, inſtead of *Reaſoning*: I do here promiſe you, That you ſhall have *the whole Field* to your ſelf, that you ſhall have the Billingſgate-*Victory*, and *the Pleaſure of a Scold*, which is, to have *the Laſt Word*.

BRITISH MUSEUM 4 OCT 70

Lately Printed for R. Wilkin,

A Second Addreſs to the Anabaptiſts; *being a Vindication of the former, from the Exceptions made to it in a late Paper entituled*, A Brief Reply, *&c. By the Author of the* Serious Addreſs, *&c.* 8°. *Price* 2d.

A ſhort Defence of Infant's Baptiſm; in the Correction of ſome of the Errors contained in a late Paper entituled, The Rector corrected, *&c. by* Edward Paye. *By a Lover of Truth and Peace.* 8°. *Price* 2d.

FINIS.